101ST CONGRESS
2d Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
101-536

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1991

JUNE 13, 1990.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. BEVILL, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 5019]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page Bill	*Page Report*
I. Department of Defense—Civil:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil:		
General investigations	4	4
Construction, general	6	22
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	12	32
Operation and maintenance, general	14	39
Regulatory Program	17	53
Flood control and coastal emergencies	18	54
General expenses	19	54
Administrative provisions	20	....
General Provisions	20	55

H183-3

II. Department of the Interior:

Bureau of Reclamation:

	Page Bill	Page Report
General investigations	24	56
Construction program	25	58
Operation and maintenance	28	64
Loan program	30	64
General administrative expenses	31	66
Emergency fund	32	66
Working capital fund	32	66
Special funds	33	66
Administrative provisions	34	....
General Provisions	36	66

III. Department of Energy:

	Page Bill	Page Report
Energy supply, research and development	40	70
Environmental restoration and waste management	....	96
Uranium supply and enrichment	42	96
General science and research	43	100
Nuclear waste disposal fund	44	105
Isotope production and distribution fund	45	105
Atomic energy defense activities	46	106
Departmental administration	47	133
Office of Inspector General	48	136

Power marketing administrations:

	Page Bill	Page Report
Alaska Power Administration	49	139
Bonneville Power Administration	50	139
Southeastern Power Administration	51	141
Southwestern Power Administration	52	142
Western Area Power Administration	53	142
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	55	144
Geothermal resources development fund	56	145
General provisions	57	....

IV. Independent agencies:

	Page Bill	Page Report
Appalachian Regional Commission	61	146
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	62	147
Delaware River Basin Commission	63	148
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	65	148
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	66	149
Inspector General	67	150
Susquehanna River Basin Commission	69	150
Tennessee Valley Authority	71	151
Office of Nuclear Waste Negotiator	....	152
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	....	152
House Reporting Requirements	....	156
Additional views	....	178

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has considered budget estimates which are contained in *The Budget of the United States Government, 1991.* The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 1990, the budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1991.

	1990 appropriation	1991 estimate	1991 recommendation	1991 recommendation compared with—	
				1990 appropriation	1991 estimate
Title I—Department of Defense—Civil	$3,182,889,000	$3,321,600,000	3,562,291,000	+379,402,000	+240,691,000
Title II—Department of the Interior	963,856,000	915,372,000	957,109,000	−6,747,000	+41,737,000

	1990 appropriation	1991 estimate	1991 recommendation	1991 recommendation compared with—	
				1990 appropriation	1991 estimate
Title III—Department of Energy	13,714,378,000	15,490,071,000	15,640,486,000	+1,926,108,000	+150,415,000
Title IV—Independent Agencies	571,251,000	473,234,000	615,632,000	+44,381,000	+142,398,000
Grand total of bill	18,432,374,000	20,200,277,000	20,775,518,000	+2,343,144,000	+575,241,000

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Committee has conducted extensive hearings on the programs and projects provided for in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for 1991. The hearings are contained in 8 published volumes totaling 14,308 pages. The Committee received testimony from officials from the executive branch, Members of Congress, Governors of several states, other state and local governmental officials and private citizens.

The bill recommended for 1991 has been developed after careful consideration of all the facts and details available to the Committee.

STATUS OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Authorizing legislation for the Department of Energy, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Appalachian Regional Commission is in various stages of the legislative process. The Committee recommends that the consideration of appropriations necessary for these programs proceed in order that timely funding may be provided for the next fiscal year.

In hearings on the FY 1991 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, the Subcommittee received testimony from numerous outside witnesses, including over one hundred Members of Congress who appeared personally before the Subcommittee. In addition, the Subcommittee received numerous additional written requests from Members in support of additions to the budget request. The requests for additional funding included urgent flood control, navigation, streambank erosion, energy R&D, and other needed projects.

Although the Committee recognizes the need and urgency of the projects requested, because of various budget restrictions the Committee has been unable to accommodate but a limited number of these worthy projects.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1990	$129,251,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	135,400,000
Recommended, 1991	167,847,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+38,596,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+32,447,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	ALABAMA				
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	---	347,000	---	347,000
(N)	CHICKASAW CREEK, AL	30,000	---	30,000	---
	CHOCTAWHATCHEE & PEA RIVER BASIN, AL & FL	---	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	VALLEY CREEK, WARRIOR RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AL	64,000	---	64,000	---
	ALASKA				
(N)	KODIAK HARBOR, AK	---	233,000	---	233,000
(FDP)	RIVERS AND HARBORS, AK	396,000	---	396,000	---
(FDP)	SEWARD, AK	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	UNALASKA, AK	136,000	---	136,000	---
	ARIZONA				
(FDP)	CENTRAL MARICOPA COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	---	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY, AZ	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	HASSAYAMPA RIVER NEAR WICKENBURG, AZ	---	---	300,000	---
	HOLBROOK, AZ	---	---	---	900,000
(FC)	NOGALES WASH, AZ	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	RILLITO, AZ	---	610,000	---	610,000
(FDP)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	250,000	---	250,000	---
	ARKANSAS				
(FDP)	CENTRAL ARKANSAS STUDY, AR	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, HOT SPRINGS, GARLAND COUNTY, AR.	275,000	---	275,000	---
	RED RIVER WW, SHREVEPORT, LA TO VICINITY OF INDEX, AR.	---	---	---	50,000
	RED RIVER WW, INDEX, AR TO DENISON DAM, TX	---	---	---	300,000
	AMERICAN SAMOA				
(COM)	TERRITORIES DEVELOPMENT STUDY, AS	250,000	---	250,000	---
	CALIFORNIA				
(FC)	AMERICAN AND SACRAMENTO RIVERS, CA	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
	ARROYO PASAJERO (FRESNO COUNTY), CA	---	---	500,000	---
	CACHE CREEK BASIN (LAKE COUNTY), CA	---	---	500,000	---
	CALIENTE CREEK, CA	---	---	250,000	---
	CALLEGUAS CREEK, CA	---	---	400,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(SPE)	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTH COAST REGION	---	---	400,000	---
(FC)	COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	---	424,000	---	424,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK, ROSEVILLE, CA	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY (DEEPENING), CA	225,000	---	225,000	---
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	250,000	---	250,000	3,000,000
	LOS ANGELES RIVER WATERCOURSE IMPROVEMENT, CA	---	---	700,000	---
(FC)	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	---	550,000	---	550,000
	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	---	---	380,000	---
(N)	MONTEREY HARBOR, CA	210,000	---	210,000	---
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	---	270,000	---	270,000
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	---	410,000	---	410,000
	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, AMER RVR WATERSHED, CA	---	---	275,000	---
	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO METRO AREA, CA	---	---	90,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, YOLO BYPASS, CA	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	375,000	---	375,000	---
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	---	175,000	---	257,000
	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	---	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	350,000	---	350,000	---
(SP)	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, OCEAN BEACH, CA	336,000	---	336,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALAVERAS RIVER, CA	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER, CA	70,000	---	70,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, MOKELUMNE RIVER & TRIBS, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SAN JOAQUIN R MAIN STEM & TRI	---	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	64,000	---	154,000	---
(FDP)	SAN LORENZO, CA	98,000	---	98,000	---
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	---	100,000	---	100,000
(N)	SAN RAFAEL CANAL, CA	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	SANTA ANA RIVER & ORANGE CO, CA	270,000	---	270,000	---
(SP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY (BEACH EROSION), CA	122,000	---	122,000	---
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	---	150,000	---	150,000
	SANTA BARBARA & VENTURA COUNTIES, EMERG WATER SUPPLIES	---	---	300,000	---
	SANTA CRUZ HARBOR SHOALING, CA	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA	142,000	---	142,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	---	210,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	WALNUT CREEK BASIN, CA	85,000	---	150,000	---
	WHITERIVER RIVER BASIN, CA	---	---	340,000	---
	COLORADO				
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO	---	240,000	---	240,000
(FDP)	BOXELDER, SPRING, & DRY CREEKS, FT. COLLINS, CO	70,000	---	70,000	---

(FDP)	GOOSE CREEK, BOULDER, CO	70,000	---	70,000	---
(FDP)	RALSTON AND LEYDEN CREEKS, CO	100,000	---	100,000	---
	CONNECTICUT				
(COM)	WEST CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING, CT	90,000	---	90,000	---
	DELAWARE				
(N)	C&D CANAL-BALTIMORE HARBOR CONNECTING CHNLS (DEEP.), D	550,000	---	550,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ	355,000	---	355,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	393,000	---	393,000	---
	FLORIDA				
	BREVARD COUNTY, FL (SHORE PROTECTION)	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	---	400,000	---	400,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, SAND BYPASS, FL	---	415,000	---	415,000
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA EROSION AND STORM EFFECTS STUDY, FL	750,000	---	750,000	---
(FDP)	FROG POND, FL	98,000	---	98,000	---
(FDP)	HILLSBORO CANAL, FL	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER HILLSBOROUGH RIVER AND CURIOSITY CREEK, FL	80,000	---	80,000	---
	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	---	---	---	350,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
	MIAMI RIVER SEDIMENTS, FL	---	---	---	200,000
	MONROE COUNTY BEACH EROSION, FL (SMATHERS BEACH)	---	---	---	193,000
(N)	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL	200,000	---	200,000	---
(BE)	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL	---	800,000	---	800,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	---	200,000	---	200,000
	PERDIDO KEY BEACHES, FL	---	---	30,000	---
	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	---	---	---	250,000
	SOUTH CENTRAL FLORIDA SIMULATION MODEL, FL	---	---	207,000	---
	ST. JOHNS RIVER, FL (WATER QUALITY MGMT)	---	---	150,000	---
	ST. PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	---	---	65,000	---
	TAMPA BAY (COASTAL AREAS), FL	---	---	250,000	---
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA RIVER AND BIG BEND, FL	100,000	---	100,000	---
	GEORGIA				
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	---	50,000	---	50,000
(SP)	GLYNN COUNTY BEACHES, GA	400,000	---	400,000	---
	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER, GA	---	---	150,000	---
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, WILDLIFE MITIGATION, GA	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR COMPREHENSIVE, GA	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXTENSION, GA	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA, SC & NC	123,000	---	123,000	---
	SOUTH ATLANTIC CONTAINERIZED CARGO TRAFFIC STUDY, GA	---	---	300,000	---
	HAWAII				
(N)	HILO HARBOR, HI	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	URBAN FLOOD CONTROL - HONOLULU, HI	200,000	---	200,000	---
	WAIKIKI BEACH, HI	---	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	IDAHO				
(FDP)	COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID, MT, OR & WA........	61,000	---	61,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE WOOD RIVER, VICINITY OF GOODING AND SHOSHONE, I	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	UPPER SNAKE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID & WY............	211,000	---	211,000	---
	ILLINOIS				
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL....................	150,000	---	150,000	---
	APPLE CREEK RESERVOIR, IL.............................	---	---	400,000	---
	CASINO BEACH, CHICAGO, IL.............................	---	---	---	220,000
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL.................................	200,000	---	200,000	---
(BE)	ILLINOIS BEACH STATE PARK, IL.........................	---	100,000	---	100,000
(RCP)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY NAVIGATION STUDY....................	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(FC)	MCCOOK & THORNTON RESERVOIRS (CUP), IL................	---	---	---	2,000,000
(N)	OLMSTEAD LOCKS & DAM, IL & KY.........................	---	3,532,000	---	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, IL, IA, MN,.	514,000	---	514,000	---
	INDIANA				
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN......................	---	585,000	---	585,000
(BE)	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN.........................	---	105,000	---	105,000
	INDIANAPOLIS, IN......................................	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	JEFFERSONVILLE, IN....................................	127,000	---	127,000	---
	LAKE GEORGE, HOBART, IN...............................	---	---	---	125,000
	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN (CADY MARSH DITCH), IN.....	---	---	---	220,000
(FDP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMPRE. STUDY, IN & IL(MID WABASH R	100,000	---	100,000	---
	IOWA				
(FDP)	BLACK HAWK COUNTY, IA.................................	89,000	---	89,000	---
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER F&WL MITIGATION, IA, NE, KS & MO.......	---	429,000	---	429,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA.......................................	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	THURMAN TO HAMBURG, IA................................	97,000	---	97,000	---
(FC)	WEST DES MOINES-DES MOINES, IA........................	---	354,000	---	354,000
	KANSAS				
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS.....................................	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, GREAT BEND, KS TO TULS	582,000	---	582,000	---
(FDP)	CANEY RIVER, KS & OK..................................	210,000	---	210,000	---
(RCP)	SOLDIER CREEK DIVERSION UNIT, TOPEKA, KS..............	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO.........................	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	UPPER LITTLE ARKANSAS RIVER WATERSHED, KS.............	---	210,000	---	210,000
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS..	---	150,000	---	150,000

KENTUCKY

	BEAVER CREEK, FLOYD COUNTY, KY.	---	---	---	200,000
(N)	CUMBERLAND-TENNESSEE RIVERS, KY, GA, AL, MS, NC, TN &.	1,008,000	---	1,008,000	---
(FDP)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY.	171,000	---	171,000	---
(N)	GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY.	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	HAZARD, KY.	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, KY (JACKSON INTERIM)..	220,000	---	220,000	---
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER, KY.	100,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY.	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(FDP)	METRO LOUISVILLE, KY.	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV.	1,065,000	---	1,065,000	---
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM, KY, IL & IN (UNIONTOWN LOCKS & D	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	SALT RIVER BASIN, KY.	225,000	---	225,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH FRANKFORT, KY.	---	152,000	---	152,000
	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE (FLOYDS FORK, ROUTT ROAD BRIDGE), KY	---	---	---	86,000

LOUISIANA

(N)	ALGIERS LOCK, LA.	---	---	625,000	---
(FC)	ALOHA RIGOLETTE, LA.	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, LA.	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE - JUMP WATERWAY, LA.	22,000	---	22,000	---
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA.	---	700,000	---	700,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION.	---	---	---	200,000
(FDP)	LA COASTAL AREA, LOUISIANA COMPRE. COASTAL WETLANDS, L	563,000	---	563,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA.	78,000	---	78,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LAND LOSS & MARSH CREATION, LA	171,000	---	171,000	---
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, GIWW TO THE GULF, LA.	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MERMENTAU, VERMILION AND CALCASIEU RIVERS & BAYOU TECH	460,000	---	460,000	---
	ORLEANS & JEFFERSON PARISHES (COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD CONTROL & WATER QUALITY), LA.	---	---	800,000	---
(COM)	RED RIVER BASIN, AR & LA, COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.	425,000	---	425,000	---
(FC)	TANGIPAHOA, TCHEFUNCTE, AND TICKFAW RIVERS, LA.	---	50,000	---	50,000
(FC)	UPPER BAYOU TECHE, LA.	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	WEST BANK HURRICANE PROTECTION, EAST OF HARVEY CANAL..	---	---	---	600,000
	WEST BANK HURRICANE PROTECTION, LAKE CATAOUCHE LEVEE..	---	---	500,000	---

MARYLAND

(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC.	200,000	---	200,000	---
(RCP)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE REALLOCATION, MD & WV.	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA RIVER BASIN, MD, PA & WV.	50,000	---	50,000	---

MASSACHUSETTS

(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA.	---	500,000	---	500,000
	CONNECTICUT RIVER, MA.	---	---	150,000	---
	HYANNIS HARBOR, MA.	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	SAUGUS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MA.	---	2,400,000	---	2,400,000
(FDP)	SPICKET RIVER, MA & NH.	100,000	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	MICHIGAN				
	CLINTON RIVER SPILLWAY, MI	---	---	225,000	---
(FC)	ECORSE CREEK, MI	---	205,000	---	205,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	---	---	---	350,000
(N)	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHNLS & HBRS FINAL REPORT, MN,M	---	360,000	---	360,000
(RDP)	MENOMINEE RIVER, MI & WI	103,000	---	103,000	---
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI	---	100,000	---	100,000
(N)	ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	180,000	---	180,000	---
	MINNESOTA				
	BUFFALO RIVER, MN	---	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	CROOKSTON, MN	290,000	---	290,000	---
(FC)	HOUSTON, MN	---	284,000	---	284,000
	LITTLE FALLS, MN	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	RED LAKE & CLEARWATER RIVERS , MN	152,000	---	152,000	---
	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, MN	---	---	250,000	---
(FC)	ST. PAUL, MN	---	397,000	---	397,000
(RDP)	WAHPETON, ND - BRECKENRIDGE, MN	60,000	---	60,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI				
(FDP)	CANEY CREEK, JACKSON, MS	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	ESCATAWPA RIVER, JACKSON COUNTY, MS	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	JACKSON METROPOLITAN AREA, MS	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN, MS	130,000	---	130,000	---
	MISSOURI				
(FDP)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	63,000	---	63,000	---
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	10,000	---	10,000
(FC)	COLDWATER CREEK, MO	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FDP)	CUIVRE RIVER AREA AND VICINITY, MO	135,000	---	135,000	---
(FDP)	DARDENNE CREEK, MO	170,000	---	170,000	---
(RDP)	DRY FORK AND EAST FORK LAKES, FISHING RIVER, MO	103,000	---	103,000	---
	JEFFERSON COUNTY, MO	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	PLATTIN CREEK, MO	155,000	---	155,000	---
(FC)	RIVER DES PERES, MO	---	718,000	---	718,000
(FDP)	ST. JOSEPH, MO AND VICINITY	140,000	---	140,000	---
	ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MO	---	---	100,000	---
	ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL	---	---	200,000	---
	STE. GENEVIEVE, MO	---	---	---	600,000
(FDP)	WYACONDA RIVER BASIN, MO AND IA	---	---	150,000	---

	NEBRASKA				
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	21,000	---	21,000	---
(FDP)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	28,000	---	28,000	---
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	---	150,000	---	150,000
	NEVADA				
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH & TRIBS (DUCK CREEK), NV	200,000	---	200,000	---
	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	---	---	700,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, NV	257,000	---	257,000	---
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	---	1,476,000	---	1,476,000
	WASHOE VALLEY, ELKO, NV	---	---	300,000	---
	NEW JERSEY				
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA.	290,000	---	290,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ PA & DE	---	---	---	1,000,000
(N)	DE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ, TIOGA MARIN	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NJ	---	590,000	---	590,000
	MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	---	420,000	---	420,000
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM, NJ	---	5,000,000	---	5,800,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
(N)	SALEM RIVER, NJ	---	150,000	---	150,000
(SP)	TOWNSEND INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET (NJ SHORE PROT)	---	---	200,000	---
	NEW MEXICO				
(FDP)	ALBUQUERQUE ARROYOS, NM	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FDP)	LAS CRUCES, NM, EL PASO AND VICINITY	130,000	---	130,000	---
(FC)	ROSWELL, PECOS RIVER, NM	---	460,000	---	460,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE	---	263,000	---	263,000
	NEW YORK				
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INL TO NORTON PT., NY.	---	250,000	---	250,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SP)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	---	364,000	---	364,000
(FC)	WESTCHESTER CTY STREAMS, SHELDRAKE R TOWN OF MAMARONEC	---	150,000	---	150,000
	NORTH CAROLINA				
	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LOCKWOODS FOLLY INLET.	---	---	465,000	---
(N)	CAPE FEAR-NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC	160,000	---	160,000	---
	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	---	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA ABOVE CAPE LOOKOUT, NC	115,000	---	365,000	---
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	---	460,000	---	460,000
(FC)	SUGAR CREEK BASIN, NC & SC	---	800,000	---	800,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(BE)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH & NEW RIVER INLET, NC	---	460,000	---	460,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR - NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVER, NC	---	206,000	---	206,000
(SP)	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH - NORTH PORTION, NC	132,000	---	132,000	---
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(FDP)	GRAND FORKS, ND	177,000	---	177,000	---
	OHIO				
(FC)	FAIRFIELD, OH	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FC)	HOLES CREEK AT WEST CARROLLTON AND MORAINE, OH	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, OH, KY & IN	200,000	---	200,000	---
	OTTAWA RIVER, OH	---	---	300,000	---
(SPE)	TRUMBULL COUNTY, OH	40,000	---	40,000	---
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	---	1,400,000	---	1,400,000
	OKLAHOMA				
(FDP)	CRUTCHO CREEK, OK	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK	---	168,000	---	168,000
	KAW DAM TO KEYSTONE LAKE BANK STABILIZATION, OK	---	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	MIAMI, OK & VICINITY	105,000	---	105,000	---
	OREGON				
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL DEEPENING STUDY, OR & WA	100,000	---	1,200,000	---
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	---	450,000	---	450,000
(FDP)	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR	---	---	250,000	---
(N)	COOS BAY, OR (DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION)	35,000	---	35,000	---
(FDP)	JOHNSON CREEK, OR	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FDP)	WALLA WALLA RIVER, OR & WA	---	---	210,000	---
(FDP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW STUDY, OR	314,000	---	314,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FDP)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	77,000	---	77,000	---
(FDP)	JUNIATA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, PA	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FDP)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, PA	45,000	---	45,000	---
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, PA	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	---	900,000	---	900,000
(FDP)	POTTSTOWN (SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN), PA	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	165,000	---	165,000	---
(FDP)	READING (SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN), PA	---	---	200,000	---

(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA.	---	310,000	---	310,000
	SAW MILL RUN BASIN, PA.	---	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA - INFLATABLE DAM	150,000	---	150,000	---
	WYOMING VALLEY LEVEE RAISING, PA.	---	---	---	1,000,000
	PUERTO RICO				
(N)	GUAYANES, LAS MAREAS AND GUAYANILLA HARBORS, PR	77,000	---	77,000	---
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR.	---	900,000	---	900,000
(FDP)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR.	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR.	---	675,000	---	675,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR.	---	900,000	---	900,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(BE)	FOLLY BEACH, SC.	---	400,000	---	400,000
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC.	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000
(SP)	SOUTH CAROLINA SHORES, SC.	300,000	---	300,000	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
(FDP)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD.	94,000	---	94,000	---
(FDP)	JAMES RIVER BASIN, SD.	186,000	---	186,000	---
(FDP)	VERMILLION RIVER BASIN, SD.	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD.	98,000	---	98,000	---
(FC)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD.	---	50,000	---	50,000
	TENNESSEE				
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN CHATTANOOGA-HAMILTON CO., TN.	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	MILL CREEK, TN.	---	400,000	---	400,000
	TEXAS				
(FDP)	ABILENE, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	42,000	---	42,000	---
(FC)	ABILENE, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	---	258,000	---	258,000
(FC)	BEAL'S CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX.	---	145,000	---	145,000
(FDP)	BOSQUE RIVER WATERSHED, TX.	---	---	150,000	---
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU (HOUSTON), TX.	---	900,000	---	900,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX (42-FOOT PROJECT)	---	215,000	---	215,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX.	---	184,000	---	184,000
	CYPRESS CREEK, TX.	---	---	---	750,000
(MP)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, TX.	---	---	---	350,000
(FC)	FALFURRIAS, TX.	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	FIVE MILE CREEK, DALLAS, TX.	---	135,000	---	135,000
(RCP)	GIWW-ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX.	500,000	---	500,000	---
(RCP)	GIWW-SARGENT BEACH, TX.	500,000	---	690,000	160,000
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU (HOUSTON), TX.	---	723,000	---	723,000
(N)	HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX.	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
(FC)	LOWER RIO GRANDE, ARROYO COLORADO, TX.	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	LOWER RIO GRANDE, SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX.	---	75,000	---	75,000
(SP)	MATAGORDA COUNTY SHORE, TX.	80,000	---	80,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	276,000	---	276,000	---
(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX	---	300,000	---	643,000
(N)	PORT LAVACA TO RED BLUFF, TX	77,000	---	77,000	---
	RED RIVER WW., SHREVEPORT, LA TO DAINGERFIELD, TX	---	---	---	1,900,000
(FDP)	SAN BERNARD RIVER WATERSHED, TX	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	SHOAL CREEK, AUSTIN, TX	---	800,000	---	800,000
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	650,000	---	650,000	---
	UTAH				
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FDP)	WEBER RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, UT	300,000	---	300,000	---
	VIRGINIA				
(RCP)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	223,000	---	223,000	---
(FC)	BUENA VISTA (LP), VA	---	600,000	---	1,695,000
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	262,000	---	262,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER JAMES RIVER BASIN, VA & WV	131,000	---	131,000	---
	WASHINGTON				
(FC)	CENTRALIA, WA	---	464,000	---	464,000
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER, WA (SOUTH ABERDEEN, COSMOPOLIS)	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM MODIFICATION, WA	---	---	150,000	---
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, ADDITIONAL WATER STORAGE, WA	42,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	76,000	---	76,000	---
(FDP)	TRI-CITIES LEVEES, WA	225,000	---	225,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(FC)	CABIN CREEK LPP, WV	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	ISLAND CREEK BASIN IN AND AROUND LOGAN, WV	---	400,000	---	400,000
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	650,000	---	650,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER BASIN, WV	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FC)	MOOREFIELD, WV	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	PETERSBURG, WV	---	600,000	---	600,000
(SPE)	WEST VIRGINIA COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, WV (OHIO RIV MI 40-	---	---	500,000	---
	WISCONSIN				
(RCP)	FOX RIVER, WI	310,000	---	310,000	---
(N)	FOX RIVER CHANNEL GREEN BAY, WI	---	225,000	---	225,000
(FDP)	MILWAUKEE METROPOLITAN AREA, WI	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	PORTAGE, WI	---	414,000	---	414,000

REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS				
COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	10,250,000	---	10,250,000	---
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA				
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA SYSTEMS	300,000	---	300,000	---
FEDERAL STRATEGY FOR AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE	350,000	---	1,000,000	---
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	9,000,000	---	9,000,000	---
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	280,000	---	280,000	---
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
NATIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT DURING DROUGHT	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATEHER SERVICE)	450,000	---	450,000	---
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	130,000	---	130,000	---
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	600,000	---	600,000	---
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	850,000	---	850,000	---
TOTAL	18,560,000	---	19,210,000	---
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	30,700,000	---	30,700,000	---
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	90,747,000	59,415,000	111,262,000	73,297,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-14,762,000	---	-16,712,000	---
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	135,400,000		167,847,000	

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP)	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP)	SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC)	SPECIAL
(COMP)	COMPREHENSIVE
(RDP)	RESTUDY OF DEFERRED PROJECT
(RCP)	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECT
(PHASE I)	AUTHORIZED FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

Red River Basin Comprehensive Study, Arkansas and Louisiana.—The bill includes $425,000 for the Red River Basin Comprehensive Study, the same as the budget request. In carrying out the study, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to examine the feasibility of providing navigation from Shreveport, Louisiana, to Index, Arkansas, and to all points between. Within funds available for the Red River Basin Comprehensive Study, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to examine the causes of the recent severe flooding in the Red River basin and report to the Committee on what steps would be needed to restore exiting structures damaged in the flooding and to assist in preventing against future flooding.

Red River Waterway, Index, Arkansas, to Denison Dam, Texas.—The Committee is aware of the critical need for bank stabilization along the Red River from Index, Arkansas, to Denison Dam, Texas, due to extreme bank caving. Recent flooding in this area has caused sharp increases in bank caving and has caused the loss of non-replaceable prime agricultural lands. This accelerated bank caving has further highlighted the need to construct a systematic program of bank stabilization. Therefore, the Committee has included language in the bill directing the Secretary to proceed with preconstruction engineering and design of the Red River Waterway, Index, Arkansas, to Denison Dam, Texas, project using $200,000 appropriated in the FY 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act and $300,000 provided in this bill. The Secretary is further directed to report to the Committee the capability and cost projections per fiscal year, to complete bank stabilization from Index, Arkansas, to Denison Dam, Texas.

Caliente Creek, California.—The Committee has been advised that preconstruction engineering and design for the Caliente Creek project has been discontinued due to issues raised regarding the feasibility report. Accordingly, the Committee has provided $250,000 to continue and complete feasibility phase studies.

Calleguas Creek, California.—The Committee has provided $400,000 to complete the feasibility study. The Committee is aware that the economic benefits of this agricultural flood protection project arise principally from a shift to more capital-intensive, nonsubsidized crops in the floodplain. It is, therefore, the intention of the Committee that the feasibility study reflect the full benefits of this change in cropping patterns.

Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors, California.—In addition to the $250,000 included in the budget request to complete the feasibility study, the bill includes $3,000,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design (PED) of the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors project. Language is included in the bill directing the Corps of Engineers to initiate PED upon release of the South Pacific Division Engineer's notice of completion of the feasibility report. This procedure is consistent with current Corps of Engineers policy for cost-shared feasibility studies. Although the Los Angeles-Long Beach study is not a formal cost-shared feasibility study, the local sponsors have contributed at least 50 percent of the study costs by funding and participating in cargo forecast studies, port facility studies, environmental studies, hydrographic surveys, water quality studies, ship simulation studies, mitigation plan development, environmental studies, and various coordination activities.

Marin County Shoreline, San Clemente Creek, California.—The bill includes $380,000 to study flooding problems in San Clemente Creek under the authorized Marin County Shoreline study.

Northern California Streams, American River Watershed and Sacramento River Metro Area, California.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the American River ($275,000) and Sacramento Metro ($90,000) feasibility studies in fiscal year 1991. The additional funds are required to enable the Corps of Engineers to complete these feasibility studies on schedule and initiate preconstruction engineering and design in fiscal year 1991 using the $2,000,000 included in the President's budget request for that purpose. The Corps is directed to perform any additional reprogrammings from within available funds as might be necessary to ensure completion of the studies as rapidly as possible.

Rancho Palos Verdes Landslide, California.—$500,000 is appropriated to initiate a cost-shared feasibility study with the City of Rancho Palos Verdes to demonstrate shore protection and other measures to solve the landslide problem at Portuguese Bend and vicinity. This feasibility study shall also address measures to conserve fish and wildlife as specified in section 704 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

San Joaquin River Basin, Tule River, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $90,000 for the San Joaquin River Basin, Tule River, study to complete the detailed floodplain studies and economic reevaluation initiated in fiscal year 1990.

Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, Emergency Water Supplies, California.—In view of the current drought conditions, the Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete a feasibility study for drought mitigation for Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, California. This study will evaluate opportunities for utilizing existing water supplies and methods for transporting these supplies to areas of constrained supply and will be coordinated with local water agencies and make use of their plans.

Walnut Creek Basin, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $65,000 for the Walnut Creek study for additional floodplain and economic analyses for inclusion in a revised study scope currently being negotiated with the local sponsor.

Miami River Sediments, Florida.—The bill includes $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Miami River Sediments project authorized in Section 1162 of Public Law 99-662. The Committee expects the Corps to develop a plan for the dredging and disposal of polluted sediments from the Miami River and Seybold Canal which provides optimal protection to the environment including dredging techniques that do not permit the resuspension of dredged material and upland disposal.

Monroe County Beach Erosion (Smathers Beach), Florida.—The bill includes $193,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Monroe County (Smathers Beach) beach erosion control project.

St. Petersburg Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided $65,000 to complete an economic restudy of deepening the St. Petersburg Harbor project.

Tampa Bay (Coastal Areas), Florida.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for a reconnaissance study of flooding and related water resources problems in the Tampa Bay area, with particular emphasis on the Courtney Campbell Causeway and the Ben T. Davis Beach area.

Lower Savannah River, Georgia.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study of the lower Savannah River to address the impacts the navigation project has had on water supply intakes near Savannah and the protection of the environmentally sensitive wetland habitats in the oxbows along the river.

South Atlantic Containerized Cargo Traffic Study, Georgia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Florida.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study for a macro-economic analysis of the regional market for container ship traffic in the South Atlantic region from Norfolk, Virginia, to Miami, Florida. Pending completion of that study the Committee directs the Corps to suspend work on the Savannah Harbor Extension study.

Waikiki Beach, Hawaii.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to update environmental studies and estimates of benefits and costs for the Waikiki Beach Erosion Control project.

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois.—The bill includes $2,000,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, which are features of the Chicagoland Underflow Plan. The Committee has been advised that there has been progress in the negotiations between the local project sponsor and the quarry owner regarding a plan for continuing operation of the quarry. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design activities on this important project with the funds provided in the bill.

Indianapolis, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $50,000 to initiate a reconnaissance study of flooding problems along the White River and Eagle Creek in Indianapolis, Indiana, under the authority of the Wabash River Basin Comprehensive Study.

Lake George, Hobart, Indiana.—The Committee has included $125,000 in the bill to complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Lake George project in Hobart, Indiana.

Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana.—The Committee has included $220,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate planning, design, and engineering of the Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana, project. It is the Committee's intent that preconstruction engineering and design be initiated and continued consistent with the plan authorized in Public Law 99-662.

Beaver Creek, Floyd County, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for design of a flood protection project on Beaver Creek in Floyd County, Kentucky, as authorized by Public Law 99-367, Section 202, along the lines contemplated by the design in 1974 of the Martin Local Protection Project authorized by Public Law 89-298.

Licking River, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for the Licking River study to conduct a reconnaissance study to determine a solution to the flooding which occurred at West Liberty, Kentucky, on the Licking River in December 1978.

West Bank of the Mississippi River in the Vicinity of New Orleans, Louisiana.—Funds have been included to evaluate the feasibility of enlarging the Lake Cataouatche Levee to provide standard hurricane flood protection for the area west of Westwego, Jefferson Parish, La.

Orleans and Jefferson Parishes, Louisiana, Comprehensive Flood Control and Water Quality Study.—The Committee has provided funds to initiate a study to determine what modifications to existing flood control improvements might be advisable to protect against flooding due to heavy rainfalls in Orleans and Jefferson Parishes, La. This study shall include consideration of improvements that evacuate flood waters from developed areas through Federal and non-Federal levees as well as ways and means to improve the water quality of flood waters entering Lake Pontchartrain, Lake Borgne, the Barataria Bay Estuaries and other water bodies from the Parishes on both the east and west banks of the Mississippi River.

Red River Waterway, Shreveport, Louisiana, to Daingerfield, Texas.—The bill includes $1,900,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Red River Waterway, Shreveport, Louisiana, to Daingerfield, Texas, project.

Connecticut River, Massachusetts.—The bill includes $150,000 to complete the reconnaissance study of the streambank erosion problem along the Connecticut River in Massachusetts from Turners Falls to the Massachusetts-New Hampshire state line.

Natural Valley Storage, Massachusetts.—The Committee is aware that there is a large amount of interest in the State of Massachusetts, as expressed through the Massachusetts Water Resource Commission, in defining the role natural valley storage plays in reducing damages from flooding. There is a concern that the continued loss of important flood retention areas through urbanization could increase the future threat to Massachusetts from riverine flooding. There is also a concern that the loss of this natural storage represents a significant environmental threat. By letter dated September 19, 1989, the Massachusetts Water Resources Commission requested planning assistance from the Corps of Engineers. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to utilize $150,000 of Section 22 Planning Assistance to the States funds to assist Massachusetts in defining the overall value of lost natural storage areas both in terms of increased future flood damages and environmental impacts.

Clinton River Spillway, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $225,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a review of the impacts that changed conditions have had on the operation of the Clinton River Spillway project under the authority of section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970.

Grand Haven Harbor, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $350,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the

Grand Haven Harbor, Michigan, deepening project, which was authorized for construction in section 202 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986. Using these funds, the Committee directs the Corps to evaluate alternatives designed to reduce the scope of the authorized project. The Committee notes that the City of Grand Haven has formally recognized the local cost-sharing requirements of this project in a resolution approved by the City Commission.

Jefferson County, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of water needs, options for meeting those needs and related environmental concerns in Jefferson County, Missouri.

St. Louis County, Missouri.—The bill includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study to address the potential use of dredged material to assist in development of the St. Louis County Port.

St. Louis Harbor, Missouri and Illinois.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to develop a plan to mitigate sedimentation at the Port of St. Louis.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway-Lockwoods Folly Inlet Mitigation, North Carolina.—The Committee is concerned that the construction of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway has had adverse effects on tidal circulation in the area of Lockwoods Folly Inlet in North Carolina and is having adverse effects on fish and wildlife resources in the estuary. Therefore, the Committee has provided $465,000 for initiation and completion of a reconnaissance report for mitigation at Lockwoods Folly Inlet under the authority of Section 906(b) of Public Law 99-662.

Eastern North Carolina above Cape Lookout, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided an additional $250,000 for the Eastern North Carolina above Cape Lookout study to allow the Corps of Engineers to contribute to the Albermarle-Pamlico Estuarine study.

Devils Lake, North Dakota.—Within available funds, the Committee directs the Corps to complete the study of an outlet for Devils Lake, with such study broadened as recommended by the Environmental Protection Agency to encompass a basinwide watershed management plan and detailed water quality studies. The Committee intends that the Bureau of Reclamation serve as a cooperating agency in the completion of this study.

Red River of the North, Minnesota and North Dakota.—The Committee has provided $250,000 to be utilized by the Corps of Engineers to collect additional flooding data in the Red River basin and to use that information to establish a coordinated Federal, state, and local approach for future studies and flood control assistance throughout the Red River Valley under the authority of Section 50 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988.

Kaw Dam to Keystone Lake, Arkansas River, Oklahoma.—The Committee has been advised that approximately 70 miles of the riverbank along the Arkansas River downstream of Kaw Dam to the upper reaches of Keystone Lake are currently experiencing severe erosion problems. The Committee has, therefore, provided $350,000 for reconnaissance studies of these streambank erosion problems.

Wyoming Valley Levee Raising, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $1,000,000 to continue preconstruction enginnering and design of the Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania, project. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to proceed with design of the project in accordance with the provisions of Section 101 of Public Law 101-101, the FY 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

Cypress Creek, Texas.—The Committee has been advised that previous concerns of the Administration as to the economic justification of this project have been resolved and preconstruction engineering and design has been initiated. Therefore, $750,000 has been included in the bill to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the authorized Cypress Creek, Texas, project. This project area was devastated by two major floods in May and June of 1989. These floods emphasized the need for an early completion of engineering and design studies to permit prompt construction of the project, which will reduce flood damages to the area.

Dallas Floodway Extension, Texas.—The Committee has provided $350,000 to resume preconstruction engineering and design of the Dallas Floodway Extension project. The area to be protected by this project is subject to severe flooding as evidenced by the devastating floods that occurred in May of 1990. Because of the continuing flooding problems that exist in this area, the Committee expects the Corps to proceed expeditiously on this project.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway-Sargent Beach, Texas.—The Committee has provided an additional $190,000 to accelerate completion of the feasibility study and $160,000 to initiate engineering and design of the Sargent Beach project. If the present erosion rates along this stretch of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) continued unchecked, the Gulf of Mexico will breach the barrier island and essentially close the GIWW.

Buena Vista, Virginia.—The Committee is aware of the serious flooding threat that exists at Buena Vista, Virginia. For example, the 1985 storm resulted in damages in excess of $45,000,000. Accordingly, the Committee believes this project should be accelerated and has provided $1,695,000 for preconstruction engineering and design in fiscal year 1991.

Chief Joseph Dam Modification, Washington.—The Committee has provided $150,000 to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of a pool raise at the Chief Joseph Dam project. The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation have expressed an interest in being the sponsors of a potential project to increase the height of the dam for the purpose of additional hydroelectric power generation. A preliminary study done by the Corps of Engineers in 1984 indicated that such a project is feasible.

Howard Hansen Dam, Additional Water Storage, Washington.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the feasibility study of alternatives for modifying the Howard Hansen dam for additional water storage to provide for expanded study of fish passage requirements.

West Virginia Comprehensive Study, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of the needs and opportunities for enhancing urban waterfront areas of communities in West Virginia along the Ohio River.

Development of a Federal Infrastructure Strategy.—The Committee has increased the budget request for Special Studies by $650,000 to be used in pursuing opportunities for providing local infrastructure facilities. The Committee intends the Department of the Army to work with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Energy and other Federal agencies in a partnership with state and local governments to encourage the involvement of the private sector in the planning, design, financing, construction, operation and maintenance of the local service-related infrastructure. Funds would be used to initiate Corps of Engineers managed, jointly financed, market feasibility studies to identify opportunities; to analyze public/private financing capabilities; and to develop model contract agreements for use in this effort.

Section 22 Planning Assistance to the States.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to utilize $300,000 of Section 22 funds to assist the State of Nebraska in seeking solutions to water resources problems including investigating and resolving streambank erosion and environmental concerns along the Platte and Missouri Rivers. The Committee further directs that $100,000 of Section 22 funds be utilized to assist the state of Alabama in addressing its water resources problems and $100,000 to be utilized to assist the state of Montana in addressing the current drought situation. Within funds appropriated for the Planning Assistance to States Program, $100,000 is to be used to continue digitization of aerial imagery for the Chenier area of Southwestern Louisiana. Results of this project are needed for the Louisiana comprehensive Coastal Wetland Study and other ongoing efforts to plan programs to offset coastal wetland loss.

Cost-Sharing Proposals.—The Committee directs that the Section 22 Planning Assistance of the States Program and the Flood Plain Management Services Program be continued at 100% Federal cost as intended under current law.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1990	$1,083,811,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	1,226,000,000
Recommended, 1991	1,362,025,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+278,214,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+136,025,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA			
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	2,309,000	96,000	96,000
(N)	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL &	66,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
(FC)	THREEMILE CREEK, MOBILE, AL	16,681,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY, AL	31,968,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK AND DAM, AL	111,000,000	8,600,000	8,600,000
	ALASKA			
	KODIAK HARBOR, AK	---	---	1,000,000
	ARIZONA			
(FC)	PHOENIX ARIZONA AND VICINITY, AZ (STAGE 2)	231,000,000	34,300,000	34,300,000
	ARKANSAS			
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR	4,820,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, LITTLE ROCK, AR	19,100,000	6,900,000	6,900,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR AR RIVER NAV. SYSTEM, LOCKS AND DAMS, A	664,800,000	8,800,000	9,800,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & LA	---	---	4,100,000
	CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	CACHE CREEK SETTLING BASIN, CA	14,700,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	17,700,000	400,000	400,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE, CA	361,500,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(FC)	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS, CA	13,800,000	2,160,000	2,160,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	62,300,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
	HANSEN DAM, CA	---	---	272,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	70,600,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	394,500,000	3,000,000	3,600,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	64,200,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER, CA	7,395,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEK, CA	60,400,000	7,600,000	7,600,000
(N)	REDONDO BEACH (KING HARBOR), CA	5,135,000	---	4,350,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	12,660,000	---	800,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	66,600,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	21,400,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CA	82,216,000	1,050,000	1,050,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT (GCID), CA	---	---	800,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO URBAN AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	21,800,000	13,470,000	13,470,000
	SAN DIEGO RIVER & MISSION BAY, CA	---	---	975,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	123,800,000	2,050,000	2,050,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA	33,000,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	908,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000
	SANTA PAULA CREEK CHANNEL, CA	---	---	200,000
(FC)	SWEETWATER RIVER, CA	31,200,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK, CA	67,900,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	26,400,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	COLORADO			
(FC)	WESTERLY CREEK, CO	8,600,000	1,242,000	1,242,000
	DELAWARE			
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	10,300,000	130,000	130,000
	FLORIDA			
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	18,300,000	200,000	800,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	830,000,000	16,800,000	16,800,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, FL	50,900,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
	DUVALL COUNTY, FL	---	---	2,400,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	6,120,000	---	2,600,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL	160,000,000	300,000	300,000
	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	---	---	6,000,000
(BE)	MANATEE COUNTY, FL	21,300,000	2,320,000	2,320,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	63,600,000	2,800,000	6,600,000
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL	31,800,000	2,067,000	3,067,000
	TAMPA BAY (PORT SUTTON), FL	---	---	600,000
	GEORGIA			
(FC)	OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA	9,300,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	649,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
	HAWAII			
	KAWAIHAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI	---	---	1,000,000
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	6,820,000	4,460,000	4,460,000
	ILLINOIS			
(FC)	ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICTS, IL & MO	107,080,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(FC)	EAST ST. LOUIS, IL	31,965,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	18,680,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	742,400,000	29,000,000	28,000,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, SECOND LOCK, IL & MO	230,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL	18,800,000	4,433,000	4,433,000
(FC)	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL	18,000,000	---	4,300,000
	OLMSTEAD LOCKS & DAM, IL & KY	---	---	6,000,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RIVER SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROG, IL, IA, MO, MN	164,614,000	14,900,000	17,000,000
	INDIANA			
(FC)	EVANSVILLE, IN	61,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	61,400,000	3,390,000	3,390,000
	IOWA			
	DES MOINES RECREATION RIVER & GREENBELT, IA	---	---	850,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS, & MO	114,416,000	905,000	905,000
	RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE, IA	---	---	3,000,000
	KANSAS			
(FC)	GREAT BEND, KS	27,200,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
(FC)	HALSTEAD, KS	6,600,000	2,300,000	2,200,000
	KENTUCKY			
	SALYERSVILLE, KY	---	---	400,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	99,385,000	250,000	250,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	LOUISIANA			
(FC)	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA.	16,677,000	2,889,000	2,889,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	423,000,000	11,688,000	11,688,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	70,700,000	4,210,000	4,210,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA.	623,000,000	1,167,000	1,167,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	148,000,000	5,600,000	5,600,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	16[illegible],000,000	15,900,000	15,900,000
(FC)	PEARL RIVER, SLIDELL, ST. TAMMANY PARISH, LA.	19,900,000	730,000	730,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,734,000,000	39,147,000	61,636,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	86,200,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
	MARYLAND			
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD.	192,000,000	14,800,000	14,800,000
	MICHIGAN			
	LOWER AND MIDDLE ROUGE RIVERS, MI	---	---	3,000,000
	MINNESOTA			
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK, MN.	29,000,000	8,505,000	8,506,000
(FC)	CHASKA, MN.	24,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(N)	DULUTH SUPERIOR CHANL EXTENSION, MN & WI	7,786,000	---	1,000,000
	HEARDING ISLAND INLET, DULUTH HARBOR, MN.	---	---	500,000
(FC)	ROCHESTER, MN.	64,200,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
	ST. PAUL, MN.	---	---	600,000
	MISSISSIPPI			
	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS.	---	---	100,000
(FC)	SOWASHEE CREEK, MERIDIAN, MS.	13,620,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	38,364,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	MISSOURI			
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO.	175,000,000	10,100,000	10,100,000
	BRUSH CREEK, KANSAS CITY, MO.	---	---	1,240,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU-JACKSON, MO.	24,880,000	7,700,000	7,700,000
(FC)	HANNIBAL, MO.	5,080,000	1,460,000	1,460,000
(MP)	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO.	649,000,000	3,486,000	3,486,000
	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN (VALLEY PARK LEVEE), MO.	---	---	500,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	207,000,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
	NEBRASKA			
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD.	21,000,000	83,000	1,060,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE.	89,500,000	2,906,000	2,906,000
	PLATTE RIVER FLOOD & RELATED STREAMBANK EROSION CONTROL PORGRAM, NE.	---	---	1,800,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE			
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME.	18,726,000	75,000	75,000
	NEW JERSEY			
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.	31,100,000	5,637,000	6,637,000
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ.	66,800,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF CAMDEN, NJ(BECKETT S	3,540,000	---	3,290,000
(FC)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET & PECK BEACH, NJ.	269,000,000	3,250,000	3,250,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.	833,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000
	NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM.	61,300,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	ALBUQUERQUE NORTH DIVERSION CHANNEL, NM.	19,520,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES UNIT, NM.	10,200,000	1,417,000	1,417,000
	NEW YORK			
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET-JONES INLET,NY 1962 ACT	218,300,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(N)	HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, NY.	4,400,000	2,650,000	2,650,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ.	268,600,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY.	11,400,000	---	3,000,000
(FC)	YONKERS, NY.	13,529,000	366,000	366,000
	NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	AIWW-REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC.	68,300,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC.	143,400,000	1,810,000	1,810,000
(FC)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC.	16,480,000	1,190,000	1,190,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC.	182,000,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC.	---	---	182,000
	NORTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND.	43,500,000	8,900,000	8,900,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER BASIN, ND.	92,800,000	26,400,000	26,400,000
	OHIO			
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH.	155,884,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
(FC)	SENECAVILLE LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFET	2,460,000	838,000	838,000
	OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, OK.	101,300,000	13,600,000	13,600,000
	TULSA & WEST TULSA, OK.	---	---	300,000
	OREGON			
(N)	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA.	328,000,000	69,000,000	69,000,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA.	679,000,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR.	164,400,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	PENNSYLVANIA			
(N)	GRAYS LANDING, LOCK AND DAM 7, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.	168,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
(FC)	LOCK HAVEN, PA.	64,300,000	18,600,000	18,600,000
(N)	POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA &.	96,400,000	28,300,000	28,300,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	16,400,000	4,170,000	4,170,000
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK, PA.	17,301,000	936,000	936,000
	PUERTO RICO			
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR.	339,000,000	18,200,000	18,200,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA			
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.	71,001,000	11,400,000	11,400,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	TEXAS			
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	64,600,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(FC)	BOGGY CREEK, AUSTIN, TX	16,700,000	2,263,000	2,263,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	136,000,000	17,400,000	17,400,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	108,800,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	64,400,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	188,300,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS, TX	33,700,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX	29,600,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	281,000,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
	RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX & OK	---	---	6,000,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	115,000,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU AT HOUSTON, TX	178,400,000	12,600,000	12,600,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU, TX	38,400,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
(FC)	TEXAS CITY AND VICINITY, TX	40,400,000	848,000	848,000
(N)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	76,000,000	---	9,200,000
	UTAH			
(FC)	LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT	32,700,000	9,070,000	9,070,000
	VIRGINIA			
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA	137,400,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	RICHMOND, (LOCAL PROTECTION), VA	78,600,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	18,900,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
	WASHINGTON			
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS, WA	395,000,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER JUVENILE FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	139,000,000	15,800,000	17,600,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR, WA	46,300,000	10,600,000	10,600,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	198,000,000	18,400,000	18,400,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	68,200,000	8,700,000	8,700,000
(FC)	ZINTEL CANYON DAM, WA	6,800,000	---	6,300,000
	WEST VIRGINIA			
(N)	GALLIPOLIS LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH	345,000,000	46,300,000	46,300,000
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	764,000,000	36,800,000	64,800,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	231,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCK AND DAM, WV	203,000,000	16,200,000	16,200,000
	WISCONSIN			
(FC)	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES, WI	26,800,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
	MISCELLANEOUS			
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1966 ACT)	---	8,600,000	8,500,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	---	3,000,000	3,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 1	---	10,000,000	10,000,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	---	14,830,000	14,830,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	---	30,000,000	30,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSES	---	25,000	25,000
	INLAND WATERWAY USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSES	---	160,000	160,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES (SECTION 111)	---	500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	---	15,000,000	16,000,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	---	5,000,000	5,000,000
	SMALL SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECTS (SECTION 208)	---	500,000	500,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-68,539,000	-68,239,000
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL		1,226,000,000	1,362,025,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Arkansas and Oklahoma, Montgomery Point Lock and Dam.—House Document 79-758, which was the basis for authorization of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System under Public Law 79-525, reflected a lock and dam near the mouth of the White River in the multipurpose plan of development for the Arkansas River. Initial studies indicated this lock and dam would be required to provide sufficient depths over known sediment deposits in the White River Entrance Channel and to provide for varying elevations of the Mississippi River. Subsequent to project authorization, and during detailed design studies, this structure was deleted from the system, because the Mississippi River was considered sufficiently stable for the entrance channel's navigational needs.

More recent studies have indicated that channel stabilization and other related works on the Mississippi River have lowered the stages on the Mississippi River at the White River entrance to the waterway. According to figures developed by the Corps of Engineers, since 1980 there have been navigation restrictions on the White River Entrance Channel an average of 42 days per year. The Corps has estimated the economic impact to be approximately $425,000 per day for each day navigation restrictions are incurred on the entrance channel.

For these reasons, the Committee has provided $1,000,000 to complete the Feature Design Memorandum and acquire in fee title all lands necessary for construction of Montgomery Point Lock and Dam. The Corps is directed to complete this work during fiscal year 1991 to minimize the time required to eliminate the navigation restrictions and protect the $1,044,000,000 public investment already made in the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System.

Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas and Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $4,100,000 to continue work on the Red River Emergency Bank Protection project. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use these funds to initiate and complete construction of the Brown Bend Realignment.

Hansen, Dam, California.—The Committee has provided $272,000 to continue construction of recreation facilities at Hansen Dam, California. The funds for this work are derived from the sale of sand and gravel that has accumulated in the lake as authorized by section 847 of Public Law 99-662. The Committee is aware that the existing contract for the sale of material from Hansen Dam will expire this year. However, the Committee has been advised that there is additional material that could be sold and directs the Corps of Engineers to continue this program until the lake is fully excavated.

Richmond Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $900,000 for the Richmond Harbor project to permit the Corps of Engineers to develop a dredged material disposal plan in cooperation with the local sponsor and continue design of the project.

Sacramento River Flood Control Project (Glenn Colusa Irrigation District), California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 and legislative direction for the Secretary of the Army to continue, without interruption, work to restore the riverbed gradient at mile 206 of the Sacramento River in California. The work will be performed in cooperation with the State of California-pursuant to authority provided in the FY 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

San Diego River and Mission Bay, California.—The bill includes $975,000 for construction of a weir in the middle jetty of the San Diego River and Mission Bay project. There is currently the potential for severe flooding in the lower San Diego River as a result of a sand plug at the mouth of the river. The weir will permit the discharge of flood flows into Mission Bay and decrease the flood threat.

Santa Paula Creek, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to update and revise the economic analysis for the project to account for current conditions of development in the area and reflect the specific hazards posed by the potential for debris.

Kissimmee River Demonstration Project, Florida.—The bill includes $6,000,000 to complete the Kissimmee River demonstration project authorized by section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 and section 46 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988.

Satilla River Basin, Georgia.—The fiscal year 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act contained $500,000 for construction of the Satilla River Basin project. The Committee has been advised that this project is now estimated to cost as much as $2,288,500 and would present significant environmental and navigation concerns. Therefore, the Committee directs that the Corps of Engineers expend no funds for the construction of this project.

O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $4,300,000 to continue construction of the O'Hare Reservoir feature of the Chicagoland Underflow Plan. Funds to initiate construction of O'Hare Reservoir were appropriated in fiscal year 1990. When completed, O'Hare Reservoir will be the first operating reservoir of the Chicagoland Underflow Plan, which will provide flood control benefits to thousands of residents in the Chicago metropolitan area.

Olmstead Locks and Dam, Illinois and Kentucky.—The Committee has been disappointed over the slow pace of work on the Olmstead Locks and Dam project. Accordingly, the Committee has provided $5,000,000 to accelerate completion of engineering and design and inititate the aquisition of real estate.

Des Moines Recreation River and Greenbelt, Iowa.—The Committee has provided $550,000 to continue planning, engineering and design, and construction of the Des Moines Recreation River and Greenbelt project in Iowa as authorized in Public Law 100-202.

Red Rock Dam and Lake, Iowa.—The Committee has provided additional funds in the amount of $3,000,000 to continue land acquisition at Red Rock Dam and Lake in Iowa in accordance with Public Law 99-190.

Taylorsville Lake, Kentucky.—The Fiscal Year 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act included $1,500,000 to continue the contruction of recreation facilities at Tayorsville Lake, which are to be cost-shared on a 50-50 basis with the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The Committee has learned that although the state has not yet appropriated its share of the project costs, it fully intends to provide those funds. Accordingly, the Committee directs that the funds appropriated in fiscal year 1990 for recreation development at Taylorsville Lake continue to be available for that purpose in fiscal year 1991.

Mississippi River Ship Channel, Louisiana.—The recent report of the Lower Mississippi Delta Commission identified completion of Phase II of the 45-foot ship channel from the Gulf of Mexico to Baton Rouge as a priority to the economic development of the Region. The State of Louisiana is prepared to sign a cost-sharing agreement for this phase of the project. The Committee urges the Corps to complete the general design memorandum for Phase II and work with the dredging industry to ensure that adequate dredging equipment is available to maintain the channel once it is completed.

Mississippi River/Gulf Outlet, Louisiana.—Pursuant to the development of a replacement lock at the Industrial Canal site in New Orleans, La., the Corps of Engineers in conjunction with the local project sponsors is directed to implement a community participation process with affected residential, business, and governmental entities. The historical nature and uniqueness of the urban environment dictate that a broad based community process is necessary. Such process shall include involvement of representatives of existing community associations and business groups in the areas adjacent to the Industrial Canal as well as representatives of local government. The Corps shall designate an advisory group for the purposes of exchanging information and receiving community opinions and advising the District Engineer on various aspects of the project.

The Corps, in conjunction with the local project sponsor, shall develop a comprehensive plan to identify and mitigate to the maximum extent practicable any adverse social and cultural impacts of the project. Such plan shall include measures to provide adequate replacement housing, street circulation, and enhanced neighborhood amenities to insure that communities adjacent to the project remain as complete, liveable neighborhoods during and after construction of the project. In the evaluation of benefits for implementing such plan, the benefits attributed to measures included in the project for the purpose of cultural and social mitigation and enhancement shall be deemed to be at least equal to the cost of such measures.

The preservation of historic properties and the evaluation of the impact of civil works projects on areas deemed to be of historical significance is addressed in the Corps' regulations on the subject. The Committee expects the Corps to strictly follow these guidelines in evaluating the impact of the replacement of the Industrial Canal lock.

The Water Resources Act of 1986 (PL 99–662) requires consultation on this project with affected local communities and efforts to "assure full participation of members of minority groups living in the affected areas" in the replacement of the lock. The Act requires the Secretary of the Army to report annually on the implementation of these provisions. The Committee expects full compliance with these requirements.

The Corps shall give maximum consideration to lock replacement alternatives which minimizes residential and business disruption while meeting the goals or improving waterborne commerce.

Lower and Middle Rouge Rivers, Michigan.—The Committee has included bill language authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to initiate clearing and snagging construction efforts along the Lower and Middle Rouge Rivers, Michigan. A large number of blockages exist in the Rivers that are made of trees and various other debris. These blockages cause constricted water flow, lower water quality (low dissolved oxygen), stagnant water pools and generally poor habitat for desirable species during low flow periods, and flooding and bank erosion during high flows. Accordingly, the Committee has included $3,000,000 in the bill to undertake corrective measures.

Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate construction of the Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi, project. These funds will permit the Corps of Engineers to do the required baseline monitoring of the Mississippi Sound dredged material disposal site.

New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift (Upper Newark Bay), New York and New Jersey.—The Committee is aware that seven barges, abandoned many years ago in the Passaic River, have become a major source of debris, creating a hazard for both commercial and recreation vessel traffic on the river. The barges are breaking apart, drifting into navigation channels and threatening navigation safety. In addition, these abandoned barges are located in fron of public parks that were built by local residents in an effort to restore the Passaic River. Therefore, within available funds the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to expedite necessary engineering, design and to award construction contracts for removal of the abandoned barges.

Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay, North Carolina.—Because the Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay construction project has not been implemented, erosion on Pea Island has reached unprecedented levels. As a temporary measure, the State of North Carolina is constructing a terminal groin on the north end of the island to protect Bonner Bridge. Several Federal agencies have proposed to monitor the impact of the groin on the movement of sand through Oregon Inlet. The Committee has provided $182,000 for the Corps of Engineers' share of this monitoring project.

Sardis Lake (Daisy Road), Oklahoma.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to determine if contractor error or project design is responsible for the deteriorating first phase construction portion of the Daisy Road, approximating three miles, and to take the appropriate action to ensure the road has been properly constructed and the problem corrected before the project is declared complete. If the problems are due to design error, the Corps should notify the Committee as to the resources needed to correct the problems.

Tulsa and West Tulsa Local Protection Project, Oklahoma.—The Committee is aware that approximately 20 miles of levees along the Arkansas River which make up the Tulsa and West Tulsa Local Protection Project are in need of major rehabilitation. The Committee is also aware that the levees currently provide protection from flooding to the city of Tulsa, Oklahoma, and property and improvements valued at more than $1,200,000,000. Construction was completed for those levees in 1945 at which time they were accepted for operation and maintenance by Tulsa County Drainage District No. 12. The Drainage District has provided adequate maintenance to the levee structures and appurtenant works, however, a large number of pipes and culverts through the levees have deteriorated in the 45 years since installation. That deterioration has caused erosion and sloughing of the levee slopes, preventing the levees from operating as designed and greatly increasing the risk of catastrophic levee failure.

The Committee is aware that the levee failed in two locations during the October 1986 flooding, and that emergency measures to repair the levees prevented massive flooding and loss of life in the protected areas. It is estimated that the levees, in conjunction with other flood control measures, prevented about $550,000,000 in damages during October 1986. The Committee is further aware that should the conditions of October 1986 reoccur, levee failure would be imminent. The result of levee failure in the highly developed areas behind the levees would result in significant economic loss, as well as loss of life. In addition, there are several large industrial areas located behind the levees which include oil refineries and oil storage areas. Levee failure affecting those structures could cause virtually irreparable harm to the environment, both in the Tulsa area and downstream along the Arkansas River.

Initial assessment of the affected levees, pipes, and culverts has indicated that the necessary rehabilitation would cost at least $1,300,000. The Committee recognizes the preliminary nature of that estimate. The Committee has provided $300,000 to perform a detailed evaluation of the levees, pipes, and culverts, accomplish an environmental assessment and prepare an Environmental Impact Statement, if necessary, develop plans and specifications for the repairs, consummate a Local Cost Sharing Agreement with the local sponsor and to initiate construction

Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma.—The Committee is aware of the significant environmental improvements that can be realized with construction of the Red River Basin Chloride Control project in Texas and Oklahoma. The project would also improve the quality of water supplies for agricultural, municipal and industrial use. The Committee is also aware that the report required by section 1107 of Public Law 99-662 on the effectiveness of the operation and benefits of Area VIII has been submitted to the Congress and that the performance is exceeding design projections. Therefore, the Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Red River Chloride Control project and directs the Secretary of the Army to initiate an accelerated design schedule for the Crowell Brine Dam, Area VI, Area VII, Area IX, and Area X and to initiate construction of the low flow dam, pump station and access road of Area X, the access road at Area VI, and the access road at Area VII.

Wallisville, Texas.—The FY 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act included $4,000,000 to resume construction of the Wallisville Lake project in Texas. Those funds will be used to award a construction contract in June that will require additional funds in fiscal year 1991 to complete. The Committee has provided $9,200,000 for the Wallisville Lake project to complete that contract and award additional contracts on other project features.

Columbia River Juvenile Fish Mitigation, Washington, Oregon and Idaho.—The Committee is pleased that the President's budget request included $15,800,000 for construction of juvenile fish bypass facilities on the Columbia and Snake Rivers. However, the budget request failed to include funds to continue design efforts at Ice Harbor Dam and The Dalles Dam. Therefore, the Committee has provided an additional $600,000 for preparation of plans and specifications of bypass facilities at Ice Harbor Dam, $300,000 to perform model studies at The Dalles, and $800,000 to continue development of prototype screens at The Dalles. In addition, the Committee believes that further analysis of the fish bypass program is unnecessary and directs that the $1,000,000 included in the budget request for that purpose be redirected to fund additional prototype testing and to determine the potential role of the ice and trash sluiceway at Ice Harbor Dam.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland Rivers, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia.—The Committee has provided an additional $20,500,000 to continue construction of structural and nonstructural work associated with the Harlan, Kentucky, element of the project, and $7,500,000 to continue construction of structural and nonstructural work associated with the Barbourville, Kentucky, element of the project. The bill also includes $11,299,000, the same as the budget request, for structural and nonstructural work associated with the South Williamson, Kentucky, element of the project.

Small Flood Control Projects (Sec. 205).—Within available funds, the bill includes: $90,000 to continue the channel widening project on Feather Creek at Clinton, Indiana, which is essential to reduce the threat of flooding and protect life and property; $40,000 to begin a reconnaissance study on Lost Creek in Vigo County, Indiana; $270,000 to begin an investigation into flooding problems in the Indianapolis, Indiana, area; $3,000,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Lake Elsinore, California, project; and $75,000 to negotiate a cost-sharing agreement and complete a detailed project report for the Krouts Creek project in Huntington, West Virginia.

Emergency Streambank and Shoreline Protection (Sec. 14).—Within available funds, the bill includes: $65,000 to protect Burton Road in Morgan County, Indiana; $195,000 to stabilize the banks of the White River at Blue Bluff Road in Morgan County, Indiana; $80,000 to continue a study of protecting Watermelon Hollow Road in Montgomery County, Indiana; and $80,000 for the stabilization of the banks of Big Walnut Creek in Putnam County, Indiana. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to facilitate the correction of severe bank erosion at three locations between McCloud, Oklahoma, and Dale, Oklahoma, which is endangering county roads and has resulted in the closure of one county road.

Small Snagging and Clearing Projects (Sec. 208).—Within available funds, the bill includes: $200,000 to complete the small snagging and clearing project on South Deer Creek near Shawnee, Oklahoma, downstream from Twin Lakes and above the North Canadian River.

Small Navigation Projects (Sec. 107).—Within available funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to conduct a reconnaissance study of navigation safety problems along the Roosevelt Canal, Lake Leech, Minnesota.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriation, 1990	$331,296,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	334,500,000
Recommended, 1991	342,731,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+11,435,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+8,231,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
	SURVEYS:			
	GENERAL STUDIES:			
(FC)	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY), AR.	2,838,000	430,000	430,000
(FC)	HELENA ARKANSAS AND VICINITY, AR	13,300,000	500,000	500,000
(FDP)	SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS STUDY, AR	760,000	75,000	75,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR	4,430,000	300,000	300,000
(FDP)	ALEXANDRIA, LA	1,220,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	BIRDS POINT, NEW MADRID ALTERNATE STUDY, MO	1,430,000	350,000	350,000
(FDP)	ST. FRANCIS RIVER MO. & AR. (FISH AND WILDLIFE)	1,120,000	350,000	350,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	295,000	295,000
	PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:			
(FC)	LOWER WHITE RIVER (BIG CREEK AND TRIBS), AR	45,100,000	385,000	385,000
(FC)	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY, LA	1,200,000	---	300,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		2,685,000	3,285,000
	CONSTRUCTION			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	3,257,000,000	109,876,000	109,876,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	33,800,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	1,310,000,000	20,300,000	20,300,000
(FC)	ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	374,000,000	10,200,000	10,200,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA:	(465,600,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
(FC)	RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	148,200,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	WEST MEMPHIS, AR & VICINITY	13,600,000	---	1,000,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,470,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	160,000,000	11,700,003	11,700,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	61,600,000	4,260,000	4,260,000
(FC)	HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBUTARIES (INCLUDING COW PEN CREEK	3,030,000	---	236,000
(FC)	SARDIS DAM, MS (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	28,300,000	655,000	655,000
(FC)	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,463,229,000)	(28,225,000)	(28,225,000)
(FC)	BACKWATER FOWL MITIGATION LANDS	21,600,000	250,000	250,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER	116,000,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL	80,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT	12,000,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES	233,300,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS	463,629,000	2,275,000	2,275,000
(FC)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (ENSLEY BERM) TN	23,100,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS	16,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	120,000,000	100,000	100,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		226,215,000	227,451,000
	MAINTENANCE			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	62,887,000	62,887,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR	---	679,000	679,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR	---	151,000	151,000
(FC)	MISS RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, TN	---	6,822,000	6,822,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO	---	7,886,000	9,483,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF & TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	---	2,387,000	2,387,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	521,000	521,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	7,106,000	7,106,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR - DEVIL SWAMP, LA	---	170,000	170,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE & TRIBS, LA	---	155,000	158,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA	---	663,000	663,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	63,000	63,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA	---	6,715,000	6,715,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	---	1,917,000	1,917,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	216,000	216,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	157,000	157,000
(FC)	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(0)	(16,132,000)	(20,932,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE	---	2,360,000	3,109,000
(FC)	BACKWATER	---	424,000	424,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER	---	474,000	474,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE	---	2,846,000	4,095,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD	---	558,000	558,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE	---	3,579,000	4,829,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM	---	893,000	1,193,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE	---	3,212,000	4,462,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES	---	1,020,000	1,020,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHANNEL	---	399,000	399,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY	---	369,000	369,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	3,048,000	3,048,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN	---	1,239,000	1,239,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	---	1,082,000	1,082,000
(FC)	MAPPING	---	803,000	803,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		121,000,000	127,396,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS, SLIPPAGE, AND PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-15,400,000	-15,400,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES.		334,500,000	342,731,000

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(N) NAVIGATION

Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri and Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $20,300,000 for the Mississippi River Levees project, the same as the budget request. From within those funds, the Committee directs that $2,000,000 be utilized for the construction of a berm adjacent to West Memphis, Arkansas. This project will help reduce the frequency and severity of flooding in the West Memphis, Arkansas, and vicinity area.

St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,595,000 for maintenance of the St. Francis Basin project. From within those funds, $1,525,000 has been provided for completion of the channel clean-out project between Madison, Arkansas, and Highway 64 and $70,000 has been provided to rebuild the bridge at the Marked Tree Siphons.

West Memphis, Arkansas.—The bill includes $1,000,000 to initiate construction of the West Memphis, Arkansas, project. Increased flooding in this area is life-threatening and is severely damaging to the interests of local residents, particularly those in low- and middle-income brackets.

Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Louisiana.—The Committee has become aware that a disparity exists in the character of the title acquired by the Secretary of the Interior for the Atchafalaya National Wildlife Refuge, pursuant to Public Law 98-548 and the authorization for acquisition of lands for public access in the Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Louisiana, pursuant to Public Laws 99-88, 99-662, and 100-202.

Language has been included in the bill that will standardize the nature of the United States' title in this area and afford equal treatment to the affected landowners.

Mississippi Delta Region, Louisiana.—The Corps of Engineers is making great progress in the construction of the Caernarvon Freshwater Diversion Project, the first phase of this project. The State of Louisiana has identified the second phase, the Davis Pond Project, as its top priority in efforts to preserve coastal wetlands. The Committee understands there is some disagreement over the exact alignment of the west guide levee in the project's outfall channel. Pending resolution of this issue, the Committee expects the Corps to move rapidly to complete the General Design Memorandum for those portions of the project which are not the subject of disagreement and to initiate construction in the next fiscal year.

Newport, Mississippi, Port Development.—The Committee is aware of the efforts of DeSoto County to develop a port and industrial park at Newport, Mississippi. Development of an industrial park, while of great interest to DeSoto County, will also provide important benefits to the adjoining counties in the North Delta area. The major impediment to this industrial development has been the lack of existing infrastructure. Local officials have developed and are coordinating a conceptual design for that effort among Federal and non-Federal agencies. The Mississippi State legislature recently indicated its support for highway improvements in the area. Therefore, using available funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to submit a report to the Committee which provides an assessment of infrastrucutre and port development needs, costs, benefits, schedules, and alternative recommendations for Federal and non-Federal financing.

Horn Lake Creek and Tributaries (Including Cow Pen Creek), Mississippi and Tennessee.—The Committee is aware of the need for flood control improvements to relieve severe flooding problems in the cities of Southaven and Horn Lake and the rapidly urbanizing area of DeSoto County, Mississippi. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to initiate construction of the Horn Lake Creek and Tributaries (Including Cow Pen Creek), Mississippi and Tennessee, project using $236,000 provided in the bill for that purpose.

Yazoo Basin, Mississippi, Lakes.—The Committee has provided additional funds to be used at the four Yazoo Basin, Mississippi, Lakes for maintenance of road and trail surfaces, alignments, widths, and drainage features to ensure public health and safety.

Yazoo Basin, Main Stem, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 to accelerate engineering and design and right-of-way acquisition for maintenance dredging of the Tallahatchie River.

Yazoo Basin, Mississippi, Demonstration Erosion Control, A Joint Program of the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service.—Erosion and drainage problems in the United States are becoming more acute with every day of exponential population growth and its attendant land clearing for food and fibre production and urban development. Conversion of forests, woodlands, ranges, meadows, and wetlands to agricultural uses, including the shifting of uncultivated or little cultivated pasture and farmland to a more extensive tiller agriculture, contribute significantly to the velocity, peaking characteristics, and total volume of runoff reaching the Nation's streams and rivers. Likewise, the higher runoff rates and volumes, and the lower ground water tables being experienced throughout the country exemplify the hydrologic effects of increased urbanization, with its paving over of vast tracts of forest, grassland and farmlands to accommodate the growing local, regional, and national requirements for new and improved highways, roads, streets, sidewalks, shopping centers, parking lots, airports, and the like.

The Nation's first line of defense against the flooding caused by the high runoff rates and volumes is the Corps of Engineers program of flood control and flood and hurricane damage prevention, which has cost about $23 billion and prevented about $198 billion in damages. The effectiveness of this program was demonstrated during the flood seasons in FY 1983 and FY 1984 when Corps projects prevented $40 billion in damages, of which an estimated $31 billion was prevented by the Mississippi River and Tributaries project alone. Another $15.7 billion in damages was prevented by the Mississippi River and Tributaries project during the next four years. Since its beginning, the Mississippi River and Tributaries project has prevented about $119 billion in damages through FY 1989 at a total cost of about $5.0 billion.

Notwithstanding this impressive demonstration of effectiveness, there is still no room for national complacency when it comes to flooding. Depite the damages prevented by Corps projects, it is estimated that an average of $2.4 billion in damages still occur annually. In FY 1983 and FY 1984, 322 lives were lost, and over 51 million acres of land were inundated by floods during those same two years. Corps studies show that within the Lower Mississippi Valley alone about 6 million acres of farmland were flooded in FY 1984. Another 7.6 million acres in the Lower Mississippi Valley were flooded during the next four years.

Given the economic, environmental, and social losses that arise from flooding, from the loss of valuable topsoil, and from sediment pollution in the Nation's water supplies, there is no question that we must maintain our vigilance and reinforce the steps taken to date to assure that flooding, erosion, and sedimentation problems are not allowed to continue unabated. We must be concerned about how to keep the water and the soil in the uplands where it belongs, and we must employ new technology and innovation in programs to find and demonstrate economically feasible solutions.

In FY 1983, Public Law 98-8 contained legislation addressing the need for vital flood control and soil conservation work caused by disastrous hurricanes and rains which covered much of the United States, including the Lower Mississippi Valley, which drains over 40 percent of the United States. The legislation provided for cooperative work between the Corps and the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) in an effort to hold back the water in the watershed areas to prevent disastrous flooding.

Public Law 98-50, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for FY 1984, also directed the Corps and SCS to work jointly to preclude, to the maximum extent possible, drainage problems which result in massive flooding, especially in the Upper Yazoo Basin foothill area. Legislation in FY 1985 directed the continuation of this effort and provided appropriations of $6.2 million for the erosion control work program. In FY 1986 $7.5 million, in FY 1987 $7.2 million, in FY 1988 $5.3 million, in FY 1989 $17.7 million, and in FY 1990 $15 million were provided to continue this cooperative work. Continuation of this erosion control work in the Yazoo Basin is vital to the well being of that region, and will demonstrate feasible solutions to other parts of the Nation.

The authority for this program was reaffirmed by section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 in which Public Law 98-8 was identified as the authorizing legislation. Having embarked on such a demonstration program to truly try to address the problems associated with this unique problem of trying to minimize the damages that result from destructive floods, the deposition of soil on downstream areas and the resulting flooding problems, the Corps is directed to continue this effort focusing on developing methods of erosion control that can be applied at other locations throughout this great Nation. The Nation's cropland must be protected and preserved.

The bill includes $12,000,000 for fiscal year 1991 to continue the Demonstration Erosion Control Program.

A joint Interagency Task Force was established to develop the program. The Task Force is composed of the Corps of Engineers Vicksburg District, the Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station, SCS, and the Agricultural Research Service (ARS). The purpose of the Task Force is to develop a comprehensive plan to reduce flooding, erosion, and sedimentation in the Yazoo Basin foothills.

The Task Force develops programs for each fiscal year that include selection of construction items, a determination of which agency will accomplish each item, a definition of work that can be done on the data collection and monitoring program, and preparation of technical work plans for the individual watersheds. The Corps of Engineers and SCS are using funds previously appropriated for construction of usable increments in the demonstration watersheds, completion of technical work plans for the original six watersheds, and preparation of technical work plans for watersheds added in FY 1987, FY 1988, and FY 1989.

The Task Force has defined usable increments of work that can be constructed in FY 1991 and the work that can be done on the technical work plans in FY 1991. The proposed work, totaling $19,000,000, was jointly developed by the Corps of Engineers and SCS and presents the capabilities of both agencies. The estimates do not include funding for the ARS technology application project that is a part of this joint program. The Corps of Engineers included $12,000,000 in its FY 1991 budget request for this project.

Listed below are the usable increments and related engineering and planning studies that will be accomplished in FY 1991 using the $12,000,000 budgeted by the Corps and the $7,000,000 needed by SCS. The construction work will build on the knowledge gained since FY 1985 about reducing flooding, erosion, and sedimentation in the demonstration watersheds.

Batupan Bogue ($1,055,000)

The proposed work includes the construction of several minor grade control structures and streambank and bridge stabilization measures. It also includes construction inspection and the design of future work.

Otoucalofa Creek ($2,750,000)

The proposed work includes construction of six floodwater-retarding structures. Construction inspection, and design of future work is also included.

Hotophia Creek ($681,000)

The funds will be used for the construction of bank stabilization, several minor grade control structures for land treatment work, and construction layout and inspection.

Hickahala and Senatobia Creeks ($3,305,000)

The proposed effort includes several minor grade control structures, bank and bridge stabilization, and land treatment measures. It also includes construction inspection and the design of future work.

Long Creek ($423,000)

The funds will be used to install minor grade control structures, bank and bridge stabilization measures, and land treatment measures, and to do construction layout and inspection.

Black Creek ($3,092,000)

The proposed work includes construction of bank stabilization, two floodwater-retarding structures, and several minor grade control structures. The proposed effort also includes construction inspection and design of future work.

Burney Branch ($2,130,000)

These funds will be used to construct another portion of the urban channel, for construction inspection and for design of future work.

Town Creek—Charleston ($155,000)

The funds will be used to complete construction of the project measures and provide construction inspection.

Sherman Creek ($130,000)

These funds will be used to complete the design and construction of the project measures.

Abiaca Creek ($778,000)

The funds will be used to construct several minor grade control structures and assist in the development of a plan to control sedimentation and flooding in the delta portion of the watershed.

Toby Tubby Creek ($60,000)

The funds will be used to complete a plan to control erosion, sedimentation and flooding in the watershed.

Pelucia Creek ($1,020,000)

These funds will be used for work on Pelucia Bayou, site preparation work for the pumping plant, and design of future work.

Cane-Mussacuna Creeks ($60,000)

These funds will be use to gather data to be used in the development of a comprehensive plan for the watershed.

Hurricane-Wolf Creeks ($160,000)

These funds will be used to install land treatment measures and complete the draft plan for the watershed.

Coldwater River ($3,166,000)

These funds will be used to develop a plan to reduce erosion, flooding, and sedimentation throughout the watershed; install land treatment measures; construct some bank stabilization and minor grade control structures; and design future work.

General ($35,000)

These funds will be used for data collection, general studies, monitoring, and evaluation of completed works.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1990	$1,398,219,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	1,389,500,000
Recommended, 1991	1,457,488,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+59,269,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+67,988,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA		
(N)	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	4,057,000	6,439,000
	ALABAMA - COOSA & ACF BASIN COMPREHENSIVE WATER RESOURCE STUDY, AL, FL & GA	---	1,000,000
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	679,000	679,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	9,292,000	14,000,000
(N)	DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	206,000	206,000
(N)	DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	429,000	429,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (MOBILE DISTRICT), AL	2,766,000	2,766,000
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAK	4,233,000	4,233,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	13,401,000	17,000,000
(N)	PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	343,000	343,000
(MP)	ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	3,352,000	3,352,000
(N)	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	13,675,000	18,000,000
(MP)	WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	5,460,000	5,460,000
	ALASKA		
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,776,000	1,776,000
(N)	BETHEL SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	498,000	498,000
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,197,000	1,197,000
(N)	CORDOVA HARBOR, AK	405,000	405,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	787,000	787,000
(N)	HOMER SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	413,000	413,000
(N)	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	253,000	253,000
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK	490,000	490,000
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	ALAMO DAM, AZ	750,000	750,000
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	505,000	505,000
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	68,000	68,000
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR	14,718,000	14,718,000
(MP)	BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR	2,997,000	2,997,000
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	877,000	877,000
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,424,000	4,424,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,917,000	4,917,000
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	2,955,000	2,955,000
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	974,000	974,000
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE, AR	824,000	824,000
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	851,000	851,000
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,202,000	4,202,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, AR	460,000	460,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	22,403,000	22,403,000
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	2,229,000	2,229,000
(MP)	NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR	2,745,000	2,745,000
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,072,000	1,072,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE, AR	4,082,000	4,082,000
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	575,000	575,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	4,831,000	4,831,000
(MP)	OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	3,522,000	3,522,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER, AR	2,243,000	2,243,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,394,000	1,394,000
(N)	BODEGA BAY, CA	795,000	795,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM - H.V. EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,274,000	1,274,000
(N)	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	3,421,000	3,421,000
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM - LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	1,663,000	1,663,000
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	130,000	130,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK - WARM SPRINGS LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	2,431,000	2,431,000
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	221,000	221,000
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,271,000	1,271,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	4,177,000	4,177,000
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	2,092,000	2,092,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	2,129,000	2,129,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	155,000	760,000
(N)	MARINA DEL REY, CA	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	187,000	187,000
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER RESERVOIR, CA	184,000	184,000
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	1,026,000	1,026,000
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,673,000	1,673,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	751,000	751,000
(N)	NOYO RIVER & HARBOR, CA	613,000	613,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	2,091,000	2,091,000
	OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS SYSTEM, CA	---	1,700,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	65,000	65,000
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	1,972,000	1,972,000
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	802,000	802,000
(N)	PORT SAN LUIS, CA	1,288,000	2,307,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	2,176,000	2,176,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER - SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	70,000	70,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	721,000	721,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	2,116,000	2,116,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO RIVER - MISSION BAY, CA	877,000	877,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,323,000	2,323,000
	SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	---	3,630,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,530,000	1,530,000
	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	1,808,000	1,808,000
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,385,000	1,385,000
(N)	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	2,566,000	2,566,000
(N)	SAN RAFAEL CREEK, CA	980,000	980,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	1,982,000	1,982,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	750,000	750,000
	SEPULVEDA DAM, LACDA, CA	---	2,500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,408,000	1,408,000
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	859,000	859,000
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM - LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,216,000	1,216,000
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	1,270,000	1,270,000
(N)	YUBA RIVER, CA	25,000	25,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	333,000	333,000
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	650,000	650,000
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	441,000	441,000
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,021,000	2,021,000
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	701,000	701,000
	CONNECTICUT		
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	266,000	266,000
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	232,000	232,000
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	255,000	255,000
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	634,000	634,000
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	333,000	333,000
(N)	NORTH COVE, CT	758,000	758,000
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	220,000	220,000
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	120,000	120,000
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM, CT	425,000	425,000
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	470,000	470,000
	DELAWARE		
(N)	INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, DE	325,000	325,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CHINCOTEAGUE BAY TO DELAWARE BA	17,000	17,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE.	22,402,000	22,402,000
(N)	MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	150,000	150,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,164,000	3,164,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	585,000	585,000
(N)	POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	500,000	500,000
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	21,000	21,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	188,000	188,000
(N)	BLACKWATER RIVER, FL	8,000	8,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	2,315,000	2,315,000
(N)	CARRABELLE HARBOR, FL	277,000	277,000
(FC)	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN, FL	4,627,000	4,877,000
(N)	CHANNELS, NAPLES TO BIG MARCO PASS, FL	907,000	907,000
(N)	CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	1,123,000	1,123,000
(N)	CROSS FLORIDA BARGE CANAL, FL	2,072,000	2,072,000
(N)	EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	465,000	465,000
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	910,000	910,000
(N)	FORT MYERS BEACH, FL	925,000	925,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	651,000	651,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R. TO ANCLOTE R.	366,000	366,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	1,110,000	1,110,000
(N)	AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST. JOHNS RIVER	2,356,000	2,356,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	1,223,000	1,223,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	4,169,000	4,169,000
(N)	JOHNS PASS, FL	330,000	330,000
(N)	LA GRANGE BAYOU, FL	60,000	60,000
(N)	LONG BOAT PASS, FL	800,000	800,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL	257,000	257,000
(N)	NEW PASS, FL	1,205,000	1,205,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	1,638,000	1,638,000
(N)	OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	28,000	28,000
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	944,000	944,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	31,000	31,000
(N)	PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	107,000	107,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	114,000	114,000
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	67,000	67,000
(N)	PORT ST. JOE HARBOR, FL	637,000	637,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,196,000	3,196,000
(N)	ST. AUGUSTINE HARBOR, FL	827,000	827,000
(N)	ST. LUCIE INLET, FL	130,000	130,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	2,196,000	2,196,000
	GEORGIA		
(N)	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	3,766,000	3,766,000
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,872,000	4,872,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (SAVANNAH DISTRICT), GA	947,000	947,000
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,533,000	7,533,000
(MP)	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	5,707,000	5,707,000
(MP)	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	3,278,000	3,278,000
(MP)	J. STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	7,671,000	7,671,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	5,422,000	5,422,000
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	3,925,000	3,925,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	5,173,000	5,173,000
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	245,000	245,000
(MP)	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	4,908,000	4,908,000
	HAWAII		
(N)	BARBER'S POINT HARBOR, HI	55,000	55,000
(N)	KAUNAKAKAI HARBOR, HAWAII	65,000	65,000
(N)	PORT ALLEN HARBOR, KAUAI	65,000	65,000
	IDAHO		
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	2,939,000	2,939,000
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	6,105,000	6,105,000
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	683,000	683,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS--OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE--CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL	157,000	157,000
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	3,365,000	3,365,000
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	1,133,000	1,133,000
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER, IL	1,923,000	1,923,000
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	255,000	255,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL (LMVD PORTION)	1,647,000	1,647,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL AND IN	14,355,000	14,355,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,343,000	1,343,000
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	4,157,000	4,157,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN	40,518,000	40,518,000
(N)	MISS RVR BTWN MO RIVER & MINNEAPOLIS, IL & MN (LMVD PO	9,935,000	9,935,000
	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL	---	150,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL	3,426,000	3,426,000
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	908,000	908,000
	INDIANA		
(FC)	BEVERLY SHORES, IN	21,000	21,000
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	534,000	534,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	143,000	143,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	340,000	340,000
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	604,000	604,000
(FC)	CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE, IN	644,000	644,000
(FC)	HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	506,000	505,000
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	597,000	597,000
(N)	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	52,000	52,000
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	450,000	450,000
(FC)	MONROE LAKE, IN	929,000	929,000
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN	478,000	478,000
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	466,000	466,000
	IOWA		
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,637,000	2,637,000
(N)	FORT MADISON HARBOR, IA	68,000	68,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	52,000	52,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	6,380,000	6,380,000
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	1,480,000	1,480,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,342,000	3,342,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,237,000	3,237,000
(N)	SMALL NAV PROJ AT SIOUX CITY, IOWA - SECTION 107, IA	5,000	5,000
	KANSAS		
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,364,000	1,364,000
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,002,000	1,002,000
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	450,000	450,000
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	723,000	723,000
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	976,000	976,000
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	961,000	961,000
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,504,000	1,504,000
(FC)	MARION LAKE, KS	740,000	740,000
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,375,000	1,375,000
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,039,000	2,039,000
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	755,000	755,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE, KS	1,503,000	1,503,000
(FC)	POMONA LAKE, KS	1,251,000	1,251,000
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE, KS	388,000	388,000
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	1,360,000	1,360,000
(FC)	WILSON LAKE, KS	1,171,000	1,171,000
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY	4,786,000	4,786,000
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,098,000	1,098,000
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,030,000	1,030,000
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	718,000	718,000
(FC)	CARR FORK LAKE, KY	646,000	646,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	535,000	535,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY	927,000	927,000
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,028,000	1,028,000
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	717,000	717,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,161,000	1,161,000
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,251,000	1,251,000
(N)	HICKMAN HARBOR, KY	513,000	513,000
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,343,000	1,343,000
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	981,000	981,000
(N)	LICKING RIVER, KY	13,000	13,000
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	573,000	573,000
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO, KY	37,000	37,000
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,298,000	1,298,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	36,435,000	41,060,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV.	4,849,000	4,849,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	723,000	723,000
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,599,000	1,599,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	674,000	674,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	4,809,000	4,809,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE KY	661,000	661,000
	LOUISANA		
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	3,607,000	3,737,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	1,900,000	1,900,000
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	368,000	368,000
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	38,000	38,000
(N)	BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	188,000	188,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE, LA	1,005,000	1,006,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	275,000	275,000
(FC)	CADDO LAKE, LA	97,000	97,000
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	3,475,000	3,665,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	2,535,000	2,535,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	10,890,000	10,890,000
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CHANNEL, LA	165,000	645,000
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	258,000	258,000
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	68,000	68,000
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,320,000	1,320,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA.	52,000,000	58,222,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	7,280,000	7,280,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	2,040,000	2,040,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER, MS	1,049,000	1,646,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT,	3,567,000	3,567,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,525,000	1,525,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE, LA	156,000	156,000
(N)	WATERWAY - EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	232,000	232,000
	MARYLAND		
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD & VA	9,233,000	9,233,000
	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	376,000	376,000
	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	294,000	294,000
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	79,000	79,000
(N)	FISHING CREEK, MD	360,000	360,000
(N)	HERRING CREEK, TALL TIMBERS, MD	30,000	30,000
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,203,000	1,203,000
(N)	NEALE SOUND, MD	517,000	517,000
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR & INLET & SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	450,000	450,000
(N)	ST. JEROME CREEK, MD	372,000	372,000
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	1,000,000	1,000,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	431,000	431,000
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	444,000	444,000
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	291,000	291,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	6,387,000	6,387,000
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREAS, MA	164,000	164,000
(N)	CHATHAM (STAGE) HARBOR, MA	907,000	907,000
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	170,000	170,000
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	285,000	285,000
(N)	GREEN HARBOR, MA	335,000	335,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	326,000	326,000
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	541,000	541,000
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	460,000	460,000
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD, FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	327,000	327,000
(N)	NEWBURYPORT HARBOR, MA	461,000	461,000
(FC)	TULLY LAKE, MA	439,000	439,000
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA	366,000	366,000
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	302,000	302,000
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	ALPENA HARBOR, MI	238,000	238,000
(N)	ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	78,000	78,000
(N)	AU SABLE HARBOR, MI	266,000	266,000
(N)	BIG BAY HARBOR, MI	135,000	135,000
(N)	BOLLES HARBOR, MI	253,000	253,000
(N)	CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI	168,000	168,000
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR, MI	391,000	391,000
(N)	CHANNELS IN STRAITS OF MACKINAC, MI	213,000	213,000
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	24,000	24,000
(N)	CHEBOYGAN HARBOR, MI	166,000	166,000
(N)	CLINTON RIVER, MI	68,000	68,000
(N)	DETROIT RIVER, MI	2,963,000	2,963,000
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	158,000	158,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	870,000	870,000
(N)	GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	121,000	121,000
(N)	GRAYS REEF PASSAGE, MI	44,000	44,000
(N)	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR,MI	781,000	781,000
(N)	HARRISVILLE HARBOR, MI	151,000	151,000
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	510,000	510,000
(N)	INLAND ROUTE, MI	19,000	19,000
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	664,000	664,000
(N)	LELAND HARBOR, MI	117,000	117,000
(N)	LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	111,000	111,000
(N)	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	120,000	120,000
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	510,000	510,000
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	214,000	214,000
(N)	MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	709,000	709,000
(N)	MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	236,000	236,000
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	23,000	23,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI	188,000	188,000
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	277,000	277,000
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	2,850,000	2,850,000
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	151,000	151,000
(N)	PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	210,000	210,000
(N)	PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	369,000	369,000
(N)	ROUGE RIVER, MI	724,000	724,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	4,050,000	4,050,000
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	15,000	15,000
(N)	ST. CLAIR RIVER, MI	910,000	910,000
(N)	ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	711,000	711,000
(MP)	ST. MARYS RIVER, MI	12,717,000	12,717,000
(N)	WHITEFISH POINT HARBOR, MI	94,000	94,000
	MINNESOTA		
(FC)	BIGSTONE LAKE, WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	160,000	160,000
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	4,027,000	4,027,000
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	312,000	312,000
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE AND BOIS DE SIOUX, SD & MN	219,000	219,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI AND MINNEAPOLIS, MN	36,245,000	36,245,000
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	272,000	272,000
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE, MN	324,000	324,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	RED LAKE RIVER, MN	85,000	85,000
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	1,745,000	1,745,000
	SAUK LAKE, MN	---	100,000
(N)	ST. PAUL SMALL BOAT HARBOR, MN	15,000	15,000
(N)	TWO HARBORS, MN	2,635,000	2,635,000
(N)	WINONA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, MN	15,000	15,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR, MS	726,000	726,000
(N)	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	149,000	149,000
(FC)	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	249,000	249,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS	100,000	100,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,302,000	2,302,000
(N)	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	164,000	164,000
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,371,000	1,371,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	4,398,000	4,398,000
(N)	PASS CHRISTIAN HARBOR, MS	323,000	323,000
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	379,000	379,000
(N)	WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS, MS	181,000	181,000
(N)	YAZOO RIVER, MS	275,000	275,000
	MISSOURI		
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	380,000	380,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,469,000	5,469,000
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	1,950,000	1,950,000
(N)	HANNIBAL HARBOR, MO	68,000	68,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,031,000	8,031,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	840,000	840,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	555,000	555,000
(N)	MISS. RVR BETWN OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS, IL & MO	10,971,000	10,971,000
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,402,000	1,402,000
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,047,000	1,047,000
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	2,930,000	2,930,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	4,749,000	4,749,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	147,000	147,000
	MONTANA		
(MP)	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	3,566,000	4,366,000
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, MT	3,898,000	3,898,000
	NEBRASKA		
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS & CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	5,144,000	5,144,000
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,296,000	1,296,000
	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATION RIVER, NE & SD	---	200,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	640,000	640,000
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	660,000	660,000
	NEVADA		
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	381,000	381,000
(FC)	PINE-MATHEWS CANYONS DAMS, NV	87,000	87,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	400,000	400,000
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	355,000	355,000
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	591,000	591,000
(N)	HAMPTON HARBOR, NH	288,000	288,000
(FC)	HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,009,000	1,009,000
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	370,000	370,000
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	558,000	558,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	850,000	850,000
(N)	CHEESEQUAKE CREEK, NJ	50,000	50,000
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	385,000	385,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,280,000	3,280,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	11,410,000	11,410,000
(N)	MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	190,000	190,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,529,000	2,529,000
(N)	NEWARK BAY HACKENSACK & PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	50,000	50,000
(N)	RARITAN RIVER, NJ	600,000	600,000
(N)	RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	1,050,000	1,050,000
(N)	SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	30,000	30,000
(N)	SANDY HOOK BAY AT LEONARDO, NJ	880,000	880,000
(N)	SHARK RIVER, NJ	40,000	40,000
	SHREWSBURY, NJ	---	1,000,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,233,000	1,233,000
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,494,000	1,494,000
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	869,000	869,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM	216,000	216,000
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	400,000	400,000
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	705,000	705,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	423,000	423,000
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE, NY	278,000	278,000
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM, NY	167,000	167,000
(N)	BAYRIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	1,417,000	1,417,000
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	3,122,000	3,122,000
(N)	BRONX RIVER, NY	720,000	720,000
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,507,000	1,507,000
(N)	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	75,000	75,000
(N)	CATTARAUGUS CREEK HARBOR, NY	260,000	260,000
(N)	CONEY ISLAND CHANNEL, NY	720,000	720,000
(N)	CONEY ISLAND CREEK, NY	40,000	40,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	225,000	225,000
(N)	EAST CHESTER CREEK, NY	150,000	150,000
(N)	EAST RIVER, NY	1,410,000	1,410,000
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	630,000	630,000
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	294,000	294,000
(N)	ECHO BAY HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
(N)	FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET, NY	835,000	835,000
(N)	FLUSHING BAY & CREEK, NY	690,000	690,000
(N)	GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, NY	140,000	140,000
(N)	GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	50,000	50,000
(N)	HARLEM RIVER, NY	140,000	140,000
(N)	HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,102,000	2,102,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	660,000	660,000
.(N)	JAMAICA BAY, NY	850,000	850,000
(N)	JONES INLET NY	40,000	40,000
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	30,000	30,000
(N)	LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	60,000	60,000
(N)	MAMARONECK HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
(FC)	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,284,000	1,284,000
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, NY & VT	40,000	40,000
(N)	NEW ROCHELLE HARBOR, NY	40,000	40,000
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	2,705,000	2,705,000
	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY	3,290,000	3,290,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	4,279,000	4,279,000
	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	605,000	605,000
(N)	NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	30,000	30,000
(N)	NORTHPORT HARBOR, NY	50,000	50,000
(N)	OAK ORCHARD HBR, NY	150,000	150,000
(N)	OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	145,000	145,000
(N)	OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	405,000	405,000
(N)	PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	30,000	30,000
(N)	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	801,000	801,000
(N)	SHEEPSHEAD BAY, NY	40,000	40,000
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK PROJECTS, NY	2,106,000	2,106,000
(N)	TARRYTOWN HARBOR, NY	50,000	50,000
(N)	WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	550,000	550,000
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	1,077,000	1,077,000
(N)	WILSON HARBOR, NY	230,000	230,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (WILMINGTON DISTRICT)	5,437,000	5,437,000
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,039,000	1,039,000
(N)	BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	416,000	416,000
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	675,000	675,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	481,000	856,000
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	579,000	579,000
(N)	CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT, NC	393,000	393,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC	1,048,000	1,198,000
(N)	FAR CREEK, NC	946,000	946,000
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	535,000	535,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	5,117,000	5,117,000
	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	---	1,965,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	1,983,000	1,983,000
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	538,000	538,000
(N)	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	520,000	520,000
(N)	OCRACOKE INLET, NC	278,000	278,000
(N)	ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	395,000	395,000
(N)	SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	786,000	786,000
(N)	WATERWAY CONNECTING PAMLICO SOUND AND BEAUFORT HARBOR,	245,000	245,000
(FC)	W. KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,537,000	1,537,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	4,612,000	5,453,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	BOWMAN HALEY LAKE, ND	222,000	222,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	6,390,000	6,390,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE AND DAM, ND	100,000	100,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	640,000	640,000
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	336,000	336,000
	OHIO		
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	519,000	519,000
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	267,000	267,000
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE, OH	2,336,000	2,336,000
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	739,000	739,000
(FC)	CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM, OH	479,000	479,000
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	3,362,000	3,362,000
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	220,000	220,000
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	373,000	373,000
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	777,000	777,000
(FC)	DILLON LAKE, OH	434,000	434,000
(N)	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	37,000	37,000
(N)	HURON HARBOR, OH	37,000	37,000
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	1,149,000	1,149,000
(FC)	MASSILLON, OH	20,000	20,000
(FC)	MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	736,000	736,000
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	794,000	794,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	5,384,000	5,384,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	177,000	177,000
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	471,000	471,000
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	75,000	75,000
(N)	ROCKY RIVER, OH	250,000	250,000
(FC)	ROSEVILLE, OH	20,000	20,000
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	320,000	320,000
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	7,862,000	7,862,000
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	326,000	326,000
(N)	VERMILION HARBOR, OH	275,000	275,000
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	371,000	371,000
(N)	WEST HARBOR, OH	75,000	75,000
(FC)	WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE, OH	586,000	586,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	390,000	390,000
(FC)	CANDY LAKE, OK	30,000	30,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE, OK	771,000	771,000
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,641,000	1,641,000
(FC)	CANTON LAKE, OK	1,409,000	1,409,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE, OK	919,000	919,000
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	3,647,000	3,647,000
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	3,018,000	3,018,000
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	792,000	792,000
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	499,000	499,000
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	589,000	589,000
(FC)	HUGO LAKE, OK	1,281,000	1,281,000
(FC)	HULAH LAKE, OK	770,000	770,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE, OK	1,790,000	1,790,000
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	2,188,000	2,188,000
(FC)	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,206,000	1,206,000
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	556,000	556,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	10,000	10,000
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	876,000	876,000
(MP)	ROBERT S. KERR L&D AND RESERVOIRS, OK	3,149,000	3,149,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, OK	856,000	856,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,727,000	2,927,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	2,854,000	2,854,000
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,240,000	1,240,000
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	2,865,000	2,865,000
(FC)	WISTER LAKE, OK	6,305,000	6,305,000
	OREGON		
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	431,000	431,000
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	159,000	159,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM-LAKE BONNEVILLE, OR	11,645,000	11,645,000
(N)	CHETCO RIVER, OR	6,000	5,000
(N)	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R. BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTL	10,883,000	10,883,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT MOUTH, OR & WA	8,571,000	8,571,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA & THE DALLES, OR	378,000	378,000
(N)	COOS & MILLICOMA RIVERS, OR	172,000	172,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR	4,166,000	4,166,000
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	274,000	274,000
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	630,000	630,000
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE, OR	943,000	943,000
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE, OR	1,698,000	1,698,000
(FC)	DORENA LAKE, OR	497,000	497,000
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	367,000	367,000
(FC)	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	592,000	592,000
(MP)	GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,004,000	2,004,000
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	562,000	562,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK & DAM - LAKE UMATILLA, OR	12,536,000	12,536,000
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	2,708,000	2,708,000
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,085,000	3,085,000
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR	10,845,000	10,845,000
(N)	PORT ORFORD, OR	105,000	105,000
(N)	ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	532,000	532,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	727,000	727,000
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	216,000	216,000
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY & BAR, OR	6,000	3,756,000
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,260,000	1,260,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR	104,000	104,000
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	709,000	709,000
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	437,000	437,000
(N)	YAQUINA BAY & HARBOR, OR	1,151,000	1,151,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,075,000	6,075,000
(FC)	ALVIN R. BUSH DAM, PA	402,000	402,000
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	152,000	152,000
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	731,000	731,000
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	1,367,000	1,367,000
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1 140,000	1,140,000
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,135,000	1,135,000
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,390,000	1,390,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	410,000	410,000
(N)	ERIE HARBOR, PA	87,000	87,000
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	777,000	777,000
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	508,000	508,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM, PA	445,000	445,000
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM & RESERVOIR, PA	255,000	255,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA	6,000	906,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,464,000	1,464,000
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,038,000	1,038,000
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	680,000	680,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	11,675,000	11,675,000
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	379,000	379,000
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	5,000	5,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	1,978,000	1,978,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,017,000	2,017,000
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	235,000	235,000
(FC)	TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	1,278,000	1,278,000
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,103,000	1,103,000
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	308,000	308,000
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	803,000	803,000
(FC)	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	1,938,000	1,938,000
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA	2,036,000	2,036,000
	PUERTO RICO		
(N)	ARECIBO HARBOR, PR	650,000	650,000
(N)	MAYAQUEZ HARBOR, PR	200,000	200,000
(N)	PONCE HARBOR, PR	165,000	165,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	1,000,000	1,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (CHARLESTON DISTRICT)	2,282,000	2,282,000
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	2,750,000	2,750,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,246,000	3,246,000
(N)	FOLLY RIVER, SC	535,000	535,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	1,859,000	1,859,000
(N)	JEREMY CREEK, SC	1,000	1,000
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	144,000	144,000
(N)	MURRELLS INLET, CS	146,000	146,000
(N)	PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	894,000	894,000
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	508,000	508,000
(N)	TOWN CREEK, SC	444,000	444,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,651,000	6,651,000
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	274,000	274,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	147,000	147,000
(MP)	FT. RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	7,334,000	7,334,000
(MP)	OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	8,006,000	8,006,000
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	3,619,000	3,619,000
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,507,000	5,507,000
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,159,000	3,159,000
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	3,206,000	3,206,000
(MP)	J. PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,031,000	3,031,000
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,258,000	5,258,000
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	11,049,000	11,049,000
(N)	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	675,000	675,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	505,000	505,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS-RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VIII, TX	651,000	651,000
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	876,000	876,000
(FC)	BELTON LAKE, TX	1,731,000	1,731,000
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,254,000	1,254,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	3,025,000	3,025,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,497,000	1,497,000
(FC)	CANYON LAKE, TX	1,008,000	1,008,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO HARLINGEN, TX	720,000	720,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	600,000	600,000
	CHANNEL TO RED BLUFF, TX	---	400,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA - GIWW, TX	1,725,000	1,725,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	137,000	137,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,037,000	5,037,000
(MP)	DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX	4,314,000	4,314,000
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	8,000	8,000
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	1,510,000	1,510,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	2,835,000	2,835,000
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	41,000	41,000
(FC)	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,040,000	1,040,000
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,605,000	1,605,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	13,185,000	13,185,000
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	655,000	655,000
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,597,000	6,597,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	519,000	519,000
(FC)	LAKE KEMP, TX	178,000	178,000
(FC)	LAVON LAKE, TX	1,970,000	1,970,000
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	1,903,000	1,903,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,734,000	1,734,000
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,052,000	1,052,000
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,026,000	1,026,000
(FC)	O. C. FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	777,000	777,000
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,081,000	1,081,000
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	892,000	892,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	535,000	535,000
(N)	SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	6,282,000	9,372,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	2,649,000	2,649,000
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,236,000	2,236,000
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,396,000	1,396,000
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM-STEINHAGEN LAKE-WILLIS HYDROPOWER, TX	1,167,000	1,167,000
(N)	TRINITY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, TX	20,000	20,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX	1,573,000	1,573,000
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	402,000	402,000
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	2,772,000	2,772,000
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,734,000	1,734,000
	VERMONT		
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	394,000	394,000
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	366,000	366,000
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	357,000	357,000
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	347,000	347,000
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	330,000	330,000
	VIRGINIA		
(N)	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VIRGINIA	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	4,642,000	4,642,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	695,000	695,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE BAY CHANNEL, VA	246,000	246,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	129,000	129,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	734,000	734,000
(N)	CRANES CREEK, VA	181,000	181,000
(N)	DEEP CREEK, VA	715,000	715,000
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,341,000	1,341,000
(N)	GREENVALE CREEK, LANCASTER COUNTY, VA	229,000	229,000
	HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR(DRIFT REMOVA	216,000	216,000
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	780,000	780,000
(MP)	JOHN H. KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC	5,691,000	5,691,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,024,000	1,024,000
(N)	LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	719,000	719,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA	4,160,000	4,160,000
	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	520,000	520,000
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	299,000	299,000
(N)	OYSTER CHANNEL, VA	328,000	328,000
(N)	PARKER CREEK, VA	274,000	274,000
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	1,562,000	1,562,000
(N)	QUEENS CREEK, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA	260,000	260,000
(N)	QUINBY CREEK, VA	366,000	366,000
(N)	STARLINGS CREEK, VA	360,000	360,000
(N)	TANGIER CHANNEL, VA	427,000	427,000
(N)	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	1,405,000	1,405,000
(N)	TYLERS BEACH, VA	201,000	201,000
(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,054,000	1,054,000
(N)	WINTER HARBOR, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA	386,000	386,000
	WASHINGTON		
(N)	ANACORTES HARBOR, WA	12,000	12,000
(N)	BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA	815,000	815,000
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, RUFUS WOODS LAKE, WA	9,488,000	9,488,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	347,000	347,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK & SAND ISLAND, WA	330,000	330,000
(N)	ELOCHOMAN SLOUGH, WA	106,000	106,000
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,027,000	1,027,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	2,493,000	2,493,000
(FC)	HOWARD A HANSON DAM, WA	750,000	750,000
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,682,000	5,682,000
(N)	KENMORE NAVIGATION CHANNEL, WA	7,000	7,000
(N)	LAKE CROCKETT (KEYSTONE HARBOR), WA	26,000	26,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,702,000	6,702,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,553,000	3,553,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,169,000	5,169,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,306,000	4,306,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	528,000	528,000
(FC)	MT. ST. HELEN SEDIMENT CONTROL STRUCTURE, WA	566,000	566,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	5,710,000	5,710,000
(N)	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	20,000	20,000
(N)	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	707,000	707,000
(N)	QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	467,000	467,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	397,000	397,000
(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	91,000	91,000
(N)	SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	29,000	29,000
(FC)	TACOMA - PUYALLUP, WA	31,000	31,000
(N)	TACOMA HARBOR, WA	52,000	52,000
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK & DAM - LAKE CELILO, WA	5,719,000	5,719,000
(N)	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	185,000	185,000
(FC)	WYNOOCHEE LAKE, WA	250,000	250,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	689,000	689,000
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	982,000	982,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,015,000	1,015,000
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,059,000	1,059,000
(N)	ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	300,000	300,000
(FC)	ELKINS, WV	5,000	5,000
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	6,590,000	6,590,000
(FC)	R. D. BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,337,000	1,337,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	872,000	872,000
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,151,000	1,151,000
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,325,000	1,325,000
(N)	TYGART LAKE, WV	915,000	915,000
	WISCONSIN		
(N)	ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	542,000	542,000
(N)	CORNUCOPIA HARBOR, WI	124,000	124,000
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE WISCONSIN, WI	485,000	485,000
(N)	FOX RIVER, WI	1,187,000	1,187,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,259,000	1,259,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI - DIKE DISPOSAL	807,000	807,000
(N)	KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	138,000	138,000
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	317,000	317,000
(FC)	LA FARGE LAKE, WI	32,000	32,000
(N)	LA POINTE HARBOR, WI	92,000	92,000
(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	360,000	360,000
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	2,395,000	2,395,000
(N)	OCONTO HARBOR, WI	363,000	363,000
(N)	PEPIN SMALL BOAT HARBOR, WI	8,000	8,000
(N)	PORT WING HARBOR, WI	135,000	135,000
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	486,000	486,000
(N)	STURGEON BAY, WI	698,000	698,000
	WYOMING		
(FC)	JACKSON HOLE, SNAKE RIVER, WY	787,000	787,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—CONTINUED

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	MISCELLANEOUS		
(N)	DREDGING RESEARCH PROGRAM	7,200,000	7,200,000
	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	6,671,000	6,671,000
	MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	1,850,000	1,850,000
	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP)	8,000,000	8,000,000
	POLICY AND PROCEDURES OPTIONS FOR PROJECT O&M	1,000,000	---
	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	9,904,000	9,904,000
	PROTECTION, CLEARING, AND STRAIGHTENING OF CHANNELS (S	50,000	50,000
	RECREATION PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE	800,000	800,000
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REHABILITATION RE	4,000,000	4,000,000
	SCHEDULING OF FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	2,622,000	2,922,000
	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	2,835,000	2,835,000
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	3,695,000	3,695,000
	WETLANDS RESEARCH PROGRAM	3,000,000	4,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS & SLIPPAGE	-18,646,000	-8,841,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,389,500;000	1,457,488,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(N) NAVIGATION

Alabama-Coosa and Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River Basins, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to continue the comprehensive water resources study of the Alabama-Coosa and Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River Basins. This study will evaluate the long-term water resources availability and needs within the two river basins. When complete, this study will provide the Governors of the three States with the information they need to develop a mutually agreeable plan for the allocation of available water in the basins.

Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor Model, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $605,000 to complete the upgrade of the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor model that was begun in fiscal year 1986.

San Francisco Bay Long-Term Management Strategy, California.—Based on the progress reported to the Committee by the Corps of Engineers on non-Federal cost participation by the State of California and other planned in-kind inputs to the Long-Term Management Strategy for dredged material disposal in the San Francisco Bay region, the Committee directs the Corps to perform the tasks necessary to complete the designation of a disposal site within the four-year schedule developed by the Corps and the non-Federal project participants. The Committee has provided $3,630,000 to meet this need in fiscal year 1991. In addition, special emphasis on finding interim disposal options should be a priority in scheduling the tasks of this effort.

Central and Southern Florida.—The Committee has provided an additional $250,000 for the Central and Southern Florida project to support Melaleuca biocontrol research being undertaken at the Aquatic Plant Management Laboratory in Fort Lauderdale.

Brunswick Harbor, Georgia.—The Committee has provided an additional $4,000,000 for maintenance dredging of the Brunswick Harbor, Georgia, project. These funds will allow the Corps of Engineers to address the critical shoaling problems in the harbor by performing advance maintenance dredging. The Corps is further directed to use these funds to place suitable dredged material on the beaches of St. Simons Island in cooperation with local interests in accordance with the provisions of section 933 of Public Law 99-662.

Ohio River Locks and Dams, Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.—The Committee allowance of $41,060,000 for the Ohio River Locks and Dams project includes $3,500,000 for directed access improvements as described in the report of the Ohio River Division Engineer, McAlpine Lock and Dam, Volume I, Section 7 and Addendum 1—Exhibit B, dated January 16, 1990. Any lands required from non-Federal interests for this work can be provided by easement to the Federal Government, but shall be at no cost to the Federal Government.

The Committee has also provided $1,125,000 to provide for expansion of the David W. Harris Riverfront Park in Huntington, West Virginia, which was constructed by the Corps of Engineers in 1985. Use of the park has far exceeded expectations and the City of Huntington is interested in expanding the park to include a docking area for excursion vessels, additional access through the floodwall, and additional parking areas.

Ft. Peck Dam and Lake, Montana.—The Committee has provided an additional $800,000 for the Fort Peck Dam project to provide for construction of a breakwater at the Fork Peck Marina. The marina docks and moored boats are susceptible to damage from high winds and the resulting wave action.

Falls Lake, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided an additional $150,000 for the Falls Lake, North Carolina, project for surveying and mapping and preparation of a Feature Design Memorandum for the Forest Ridge Peninsula Park.

Eufaula Lake, Oklahoma.—The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for FY 1988 provided $388,000 to construct a facility to serve as a Water Resources Information and Visitors Center at Crowder Point on Eufaula Lake, Oklahoma. The following year, Congress appropriated an additional $500,000 in operation and maintenance funds for Eufaula Lake and directed the Corps to expend these additional funds for improvements to roads, utilities, and other facilities in the existing Crowder Point East Recreation Area.

During the past year, the Corps has been negotiating a Local Cooperation Agreement (LCA) with a non-Federal sponsor for cost-sharing the construction of the Water Resources Information and Visitors Center. However, the Corps has included the $500,000 in operation and maintenance funds in the amount to be cost-shared by the non-Federal sponsor.

The Visitors Center and the improvements to the Crowder Point East Recreation Area are two separate projects, and the appropriations for these projects are not linked. It was the Committee's intent that the $500,000 be expended for improvements to the Crowder Point East Recreation Area at full Federal expense, regardless of whether an LCA for the Visitors Center is ever executed. Therefore, language has been included in the bill directing the Corps to expend the $500,000 in operation and maintenance funds previously appropriated for Eufaula Lake for completion during FY 1991 of the designated improvements at the Crowder Point Recreation Area at full Federal expense.

Skiatook Lake, Oklahoma.—The Committee is aware that the Tulsa District of the Corps of Engineers provided limited recreation development at the public access points at Skiatook Lake, Oklahoma, and that seven of the eight public use areas do not have a potable water supply. Since the opening of the lake to the public, visitation has been greater than projected in the original project design and there is a need to provide potable water to protect the health and safety of the public. Accordingly, the Committee has provided an additional $1,200,000 to provide treated water to the seven public use areas which do not now have that service.

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,500,000 for the Tillamook Bay and Bar project to be used for capping the north jetty to prevent further erosion. The jetty is presently losing about 35 feet per year and has already lost about 425 feet. In addition, $250,000 has been provided for maintenance dredging of the Garibaldi Boat Basin.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania.—The Johnstown, Pennsylvania, project is one of the oldest Corps-constructed local protection projects in the United States. The project was constructed as a response to the flood of 1936 and has prevented over $400,000,000 in damages. At the time the project was built, a number of existing non-Federal buildings, roadway embankments and walls were incorporated in the line of protection without the acquisition of residual real estate interests. This has led to a serious situation in which deteriorated structures cannot be repaired because they are outside the boundaries of the project. Several structures have collapsed, with only essential repairs undertaken, and the situation is expected to worsen. The age of this Federally maintained project makes it a candidate for an intensive review of its overall condition, and the Committee expects the Army to completely restore the project to insure that it continues to protect the community in the future as well as it has in the past.

Mount St. Helens Sediment Control Structure, Washington.—The Committee has been advised that the schedule established by the Corps of Engineers for removal of debris from the Mount St. Helens Sediment Control Structure does not consider the needs of migrating juvenile fish. The Committee, therefore, directs the Corps of Engineers to work with the State of Washington and coordinate its debris removal operations to coincide with downstream migration of juvenile steelhead and salmon.

Scheduling of Flood Control Reservoir Operations.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers Scheduling of Reservoir Operations program. Using those funds, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) and operation plan (Plan) to provide the basis for Congressional direction in fiscal year 1992 to implement the proposal to reoperate Folsom Dam, California, for greater flood control purposes. The EIS and Plan should assume operation of Lake Folsom at a level sufficient to achieve protection for the Sacramento area against floods of a 100-year frequency as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The EIS should evaluate reoperation for a 10-year period. The Plan should identify a non-Federal sponsor for the reoperation of the reservoir and present a cost-sharing formula for the reoperation to compensate for impacts on authorized project purposes.

Wetlands Research Program.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers Wetlands Research Program. The additional funds will permit the Corps to initiate work on a field demonstration in the Yolo Basin Wildlife Area, California. An interagency group has proposed a plan to develop Putah Creek wetlands in the Yolo Bypass. Under the plan, approximately 16,000 acres of wetlands would be created as a joint venture with the Corps providing engineering expertise to develop plans for the project, overall project management, and funds to initiate the wetlands development. The Committee expects the Corps to ensure that adequate funds, when combined with those of other participants in the project, are included in future budget requests to complete this field demonstration.

Wetlands Enhancement.—The Corps of Engineers has authority to plan and establish wetlands areas as part of water resources development projects and to modify structures and operation of projects for the purpose of improving the quality of the environment and for fish and wildlife enhancement. The Committee stronly encourages the Corps to use these authorities as part of efforts to support national efforts to preserve wetlands resources. One example of how this authority is appropriately used is the restoration of Queen Bess Island in Louisiana, an important nesting area for the brown pelican, where the Corps is using dredged material from the maintenance of Barataria Bay Waterway to rebuild wetland habitat.

The Committee has included sufficient maintenance funding for the Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black, Louisiana, the Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana, Houma Navigation Channel, Louisiana, and Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf, Louisiana, projects to permit the Corps to create additional coastal marsh as part of its regularly scheduled maintenance activities, particularly maintenance dredging of waterways. In addition, the Committee expects the Corps to use its authority under Section 150 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976, Section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, and other appropriate provisions to develop a vigorous program to create and enhance vegetated wetlands. As part of its FY 1992 budget submission, the Corps should specifically identify additional opportunities to enhance wetlands in connection with the construction and operation of its projects even if funding for such enhancement is not budgeted.

Rehabilitation at Hydroelectric Powerplants.—The Committee is concerned that policy changes being considered by the Corps of Engineers regarding the rehabilitation of hydroelectric powerplants may be having an adverse impact on the Corps' ability to provide a reliable supply of power.

Because of improvements in technology, rehabilitation of generators and turbines often results in increases in the capacity of the powerplant. The Committee has been advised that the Corps is considering delaying needed rehabilitation until a sponsor is found who is willing to provide up-front funding for the rehabilitation. In exchange for funding the rehabilitation work, the sponsor would receive the rights to the additional power generated.

The Committee is opposed to these financing proposals and is convinced that they are not in the public interest and are inconsistent with the Federal responsibility for operation and maintenance of power facilities and marketing of power. In addition, these different financing arrangements could have a detrimental effect on the amount of funds deposited in the Treasury. Receipts from the sale of power from Corps projects totaling over $370 million are deposited in the U.S. Treasury each year.

The Committee believes that the maintenance of a reliable power supply from its hydroelectric powerplants is a high priority mission of the Corps and directs that the Corps not seek alternative financing methods for performing needed rehabilitation.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1990	$68,455,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	75,100,000
Recommended, 1991	71,100,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+2,645,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	−4,000,000

This appropriation provides for salaries and related costs to administer laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands of the United States in accordance with the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, the Clean Water Act of 1977, and the Marine Protection Act of 1972.

The Fiscal Year 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act contained $4,000,000 for the administration of bridges function, which was to be transferred from the U.S. Coast Guard to the Corps of Engineers. However, legislation authorizing the transfer has not been enacted and the $4,000,000 provided is not being utilized. Therefore, the Committee has reduced the budget request for the Regulatory Program by $4,000,000 and directs the Corps to utilize the funds provided in fiscal year 1990 for bridge administration for other activities within the Regulatory Program in fiscal year 1991.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation, 1990	$20,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	25,000,000
Recommended, 1991	25,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+5,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	....

This activity provides for flood emergency preparation, flood fighting and rescue operations, and repair of flood control and Federal hurricane or shore protection works. It also provides for emergency supplies of clean drinking water where the source has been contaminated and, in drought distressed areas, provision of adequate supplies of water for human and livestock consumption.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1990	$141,997,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	136,100,000
Recommended, 1991	136,100,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−5,897,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	....

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the division offices, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

Small Business Competitive Demonstration Program for Dredging.—The Committee supports the objectives of the small business competitive demonstration program for dredging. However, the committee is concerned with the consequences of applying small business set asides to Corps of Engineers' dredging contracts without recognizing equipment and other differences in capabilities of large and small dredgers. The Secretary of the Army is strongly encouraged by the committee to ensure the most efficient use of the limited funds available to the national dredging program and to carefully consider the differing capabilities of large and small dredgers.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Arkansas and Oklahoma, Boudinot Safety Harbor.—The Committee has observed with great interest the military utilization of the inland waterways which was initiated in 1986 by the Oklahoma Army National Guard, working with the Corps of Engineers. The Committee is aware that since that time 11 moves of military equipment have taken place over a wide portion of the Nation's inland waterway system. These moves represent a total of 13,000 miles of transit involving some 1,400 pieces of equipment. The savings accruing to the Nation have been significant. The Committee believes that the improvement of loading and related facilities at Boudinot Harbor, Oklahoma, on the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System will provide needed access to the nearby Camp Gruber Training Site and will facilitate the continued use of the inland waterways by National Guard and other units who train at that site routinely. The Committee has provided $400,000 to construct these already designed improvements and directs the Secretary of the Army to initiate and complete this work during fiscal year 1991.

Denison Dam-Lake Texoma, Texas.—The Committee is aware that sediment has accumulated in the Pennington Creek arm of the Washita River near Tishomingo, Oklahoma, thereby rendering the water unusable for boating, swimming and other related recreation purposes at the Tishomingo City Park. A total of $320,000 was provided in fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for dredging this area to restore recreational purposes. The Committee is further aware that the Corps of Engineers in pursuing efforts to accomplish this dredging has determined that a sediment control structure together with limited dredging would provide the best solution to restore recreation in the area. It is the Committee's understanding that the local sponsor is willing to operate and maintain this facility after completion of construction. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to proceed with plans and construct this project as outlined in the Tulsa District report as submitted to the Chief of Engineers on February 22, 1989.

Wynoochee Lake, Washington.—The FY 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act provided debt relief to the city of Aberdeen resulting from delays in the transfer of operation, maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation (OMR&R) reponsibility of the Wynoochee Lake project to the city. The transfer has proven more difficult than originally anticipated but is scheduled to take place in July of 1990. As a result of the delay, the city of Aberdeen faces additional unanticipated OMR&R costs. Therefore, the Committee has extended the period of debt relief for the city of Aberdeen from October 1, 1989, to the date of OMR&R transfer of the city.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1990	$11,369,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	11,456,000
Recommended, 1991	12,926,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+1,557,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+1,470,000

The Budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION [1]

PROJECT TITLE		BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
ARIZONA			
UPPER SAN PEDRO RIVER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	480,000	75,000	75,000
CALIFORNIA			
AMERICAN RIVER FOLSOM SOUTH OPTIMIZATION STUDY	250,000	50,000	50,000
DELTA WATER MANAGEMENT	---	---	350,000
INDIAN WELLS VALLEY WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	525,000	175,000	175,000
OFFSTREAM STORAGE INVESTIGATION	---	---	150,000
REFUGE WATER SUPPLY	---	---	200,000
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN	---	---	180,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE	1,800,000	200,000	200,000
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONVEYANCE	---	---	50,000
SANTA ANA WATERSHED MANAGEMENT STUDY	500,000	99,000	99,000
SMALL PROJECT INTEGRATION WITH CVP	190,000	60,000	---
COLORADO			
SOUTH PLATTE RIVER OPERATIONS STUDY	---	---	75,000
UPPER GUNNISON-UNCOMPAHGRE BASIN PROJECT	920,000	280,000	280,000
IDAHO			
IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT	525,000	75,000	75,000
MINIDOKA, NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIV. DRAINWTR MGMT STDY	350,000	80,000	80,000
KANSAS			
ARKANSAS RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT STUDY	990,000	240,000	240,000
MONTANA			
FLATHEAD RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION STUDY	495,000	215,000	215,000
NEBRASKA			
PRAIRIE BEND UNIT, P-SMBP	---	---	200,000
NEVADA			
NORTHERN NEVADA WATER AUGMENTATION PROGRAM	500,000	180,000	180,000
NEW MEXICO			
NEW MEXICO REGIONAL WATER RESOURCES STUDY	600,000	200,000	200,000
OKLAHOMA			
NORTHWEST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	---	---	150,000
OREGON			
GRAND RONDE BASIN WATER OPT. STUDY	---	---	75,000
JOSEPHINE COUNTY WATER MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT STUDY	670,000	200,000	200,000
NORTHERN DOUGLAS CO. COOP. WATER RESOURCES STUDY	1,179,209	50,000	50,000
UPPER DESCHUTES RIVER BASIN WATER CONSERVATION PROJECT	745,000	290,000	290,000
UPPER JOHN DAY WATER OPTIMIZATION PROJECT	710,584	250,000	250,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	591,603	180,000	180,000
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BLACK HILLS HYDROLOGY STUDY	---	---	100,000
TEXAS			
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN TOTAL WATER MGMT STUDY	650,000	200,000	300,000
UTAH			
SEVIER RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	463,508	120,000	120,000
UTAH AREA WATER DEMAND MODEL	275,000	100,000	100,000
WASHINGTON			
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	7,944,758	540,000	540,000
WYOMING			
WIND RIVER BASIN STUDY	425,000	37,000	37,000
VARIOUS			
COLORADO RIVER RECHARGE STUDY	280,000	30,000	30,000
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	43,726,650	935,000	935,000
DROUGHT INVESTIGATIONS	1,640,000	220,000	220,000
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	5,832,378	2,699,000	2,699,000
FOUR CORNERS WATER ASSESSMENT	440,000	150,000	150,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	9,250,506	875,000	875,000
INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS	1,023,187	390,000	390,000
MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS	993,620	521,000	521,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	2,943,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
TOXIC CONSTITUENT STUDIES	1,164,000	265,000	265,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION	723,984	125,000	125,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		11,456,000	12,926,000

Delta Water Management Study, California.—The Committee has provided $350,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to participate with the Corps of Engineers and the State of California in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta survey studies.

Refuge Water Supplies, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 to continue advanced planning of the Refuge Water Supplies project.

Small Project Integration with CVP, California.—No funds are provided for the proposed study of the integration of small projects in California into the Central Valley Project. The Bureau of Reclamation is directed not to proceed with such an unwarranted study.

Prairie Bend Unit, Nebraska.—The Committee has provided $200,000 to continue advance planning for the Prairie Bend Unit, Nebraska. The Committee is aware that the local project sponsors are interested in pursuing a scaled down version of the project recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation. The funds provided will permit the Bureau to proceed with design of the features of the project desired by local interests.

Black Hills Hydrology Study, South Dakota.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate a study of the complex hydrologic system in the Black Hills of South Dakota. The funds provided will permit the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in an interagency planning group that is developing a plan of study.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1990	$652,850,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	609,430,000
Recommended, 1991	649,697,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−3,153,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+40,267,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS			
ARIZONA			
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT	52,000,000	8,872,000	8,872,000
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT PROJECT (SAWRSA)........	27,553,000	11,177,000	11,177,000
CALIFORNIA			
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:			
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT..............................	2,164,041,000	1,500,000	1,750,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS........................	693,906,000	2,400,000	2,600,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.............................	365,868,000	3,866,000	3,866,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION...................................	349,570,000	1,715,000	1,715,000
SAN LUIS UNIT...	1,354,922,000	2,911,000	2,911,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM.....................	302,742,000	7,362,000	7,362,000
COLORADO			
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP...................	263,854,000	14,732,000	14,732,000
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP...........	169,338,000	4,726,000	4,726,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.................	87,280,000	3,380,000	3,380,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION........	94,000,000	6,810,000	6,810,000
NEBRASKA			
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP............................	348,610,000	21,646,000	21,646,000
O'NEILL UNIT, P-SMBP...................................	173,200,000	600,000	600,000
NORTH DAKOTA			
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT................................	---	---	30,000,000
OREGON			
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT.................................	---	---	7,052,000
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP.............................	49,256,000	8,024,000	8,024,000
MNI WICONI RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT..................	---	---	1,500,000
WEB RURAL WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT....................	111,949,857	945,000	945,000
WASHINGTON			
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:			
IRRIGATION FACILITIES..................................	4,310,476,184	3,900,000	4,300,000
THIRD POWERPLANT, GRAND COULEE DAM.....................	747,420,184	3,348,000	5,348,000
WYOMING			
BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP..................	80,150,000	11,930,000	11,930,000
VARIOUS			
BOULDER CANYON PROJECT.................................	65,000,000	23,920,000	23,920,000
MEASURES BELOW IMPERIAL DAM, TITLE I, CRBSCP...........	481,536,000	14,295,000	14,295,000
SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION.........................		158,059,000	199,461,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:			
ARBUCKLE PROJECT, OKLAHOMA.............................	---	---	500,000
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO.................	36,287,000	1,980,000	1,980,000
BRANTLEY PROJECT, NEW MEXICO...........................	141,432,605	500,000	500,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT, WA	89,086,000	739,000	739,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK & LEVEE SYSTEM, AR, CO....	118,403,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES ACT., ID,ND,NE,MT,ORE,SD,WA,WY...	2,535,000	75,000	75,000
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO...................	508,186,436	1,470,000	1,470,000
GERING IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NEBRASKA...................	---	---	100,000
GILA PROJECT, ARIZONA..................................	78,115,000	368,000	368,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA.....................	54,100,000	1,186,000	1,186,000
LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL, COLORADO...............	16,096,000	3,360,000	3,360,000
MCGEE CREEK, PROJECT, OKLAHOMA.........................	119,484,492	500,000	500,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT.......................................	4,057,000	702,000	702,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA...............................	32,913,000	950,000	950,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:			
EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA...............................	24,230,000	50,000	50,000
FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA.................................	43,036,000	460,000	730,000
OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA................................	490,000,000	65,000	65,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING................................	7,006,000	15,000	15,000
RECREATION FACILITIES AT EXISTING RESERVOIRS,VARIOUS	315,000	315,000	315,000
WASHOE PROJECT, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA......................	362,117,000	305,000	305,000
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT, VARIOUS..........................	20,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE AND PROTECTIVE FACILITIES, WASH.	43,006,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION..........		25,240,000	26,110,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:			
BIA - DAM SAFETY PROGRAM...............................	142,655,000	9,055,000	---
BOISE PROJECT, DEER FLAT DAM, IDAHO....................	27,900,000	17,225,000	17,225,000
CACHUMA PROJECT, BRADBURY DAM, CALIFORNIA..............	50,260,000	280,000	280,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, SAN LUIS UN.,O'NEILL DAM, CA	2,475,000	1,980,000	1,980,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.......	7,477,550	650,000	650,000
HYRUM PROJECT, UTAH....................................	2,316,273	1,350,000	1,350,000
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION.........................	145,521,000	15,725,000	15,725,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, JACKSON LAKE DAM, IDAHO-WYOMING...	76,537,647	409,000	409,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS AND PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY...	53,561,253	2,550,000	2,550,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, BARTLETT DAM, ARIZONA..............	68,733,000	2,550,000	2,550,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSESHOE DAM, ARIZONA.............	32,867,000	850,000	850,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA.......	37,349,942	3,394,000	3,394,000
SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION - COOLIDGE DAM, AZ...............	49,500,000	5,130,000	5,130,000
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT, ALTUS DAM, OKLAHOMA...............	11,365,000	5,200,000	5,200,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS...............................		67,348,000	58,293,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:			
BOSTWICK IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NE.......................	---	---	150,000
HIGHLAND-HANOVER DIVISION, P-SMBP, WY..................	300,000	150,000	150,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—CONTINUED

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
HYRUM PROJECT, UTAH	2,100,000	786,000	786,000
MILK RIVER, GLASGOW DIVISION, MT	2,050,000	410,000	410,000
MILK RIVER, MALTA DIVISION, MT	5,600,000	560,000	560,000
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT, UTAH	11,869,000	1,954,000	1,954,000
SARGENT IRRIGATION DISTRICT, P-SMBP, NE	---	---	200,000
UPPER BLUFF DIVISION, P-SMBP, WY	220,000	110,000	110,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH	8,900,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT		5,170,000	5,620,000
PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY:			
COLORADO RIVER BRIDGE CROSSING	45,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
SUBTOTAL, PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY		1,000,000	1,000,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:			
ATMOSPHERIC WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	---	---	3,200,000
GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE	28,220,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	28,338,147	4,503,000	4,503,000
WATER TECHNOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	201,886,130	6,400,000	6,400,000
SUBTOTAL, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY		13,303,000	16,503,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS		271,120,000	307,887,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT			
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND			
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS			
COLORADO			
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT	340,233,500	13,415,000	13,415,000
DOLORES PROJECT	468,838,000	48,060,000	48,060,000
UTAH			
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT	1,683,067,072	81,773,000	81,773,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT	188,542,000	50,000	60,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:			
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, JENSEN UNIT, UTAH	70,299,000	30,000	30,000
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT, COLORADO	130,738,000	748,000	745,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:			
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES	178,525,881	11,836,000	11,836,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES	262,438,286	15,132,000	15,132,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT		172,031,000	172,031,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT			
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT			
ARIZONA			
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF)	2,938,252,000	182,268,000	185,768,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, NON-INDIAN DISTR. SYSTEMS	297,637,000	1,996,000	1,996,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA-SAFETY OF DAMS	71,896,000	14,202,000	14,202,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT		198,466,000	201,966,000
ASSOCIATED ITEMS			
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	---	-32,187,000	-32,187,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		609,430,000	649,697,000

Central Arizona Project, Arizona.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,500,000 for the Central Arizona Project (CAP) to be used to protect the town of Marana against increased flood and erosion damages caused by a CAP siphon outlet and canal within the Santa Cruz River floodplain. In addition, the project would protect the siphon and canal from overtopping and erosion during flood flows on the Santa Cruz River.

Central Valley Project, Auburn-Folsom Unit, California.—The Committee has provided $250,000 to the Bureau of Reclamation for the Federal share of a feasibility study of the water supply and power benefits of a multipurpose dam near Auburn, California. In performing this study, the Bureau is to assume that the flood control only dam with advanced measures, known as the "expandable" flood control dam, supported by the State of California Reclamation Board, will be authorized and constructed by the Corps of Engineers. The Bureau is directed to study the expansion of the flood control only dam to address water supply and power and other purposes, and to prepare the appropriate environmental documentation for the expansion.

The Committee has provided these funds in response to new expressions of interest in a study of the multipurpose Auburn Dam. However, the funds are not provided for a study of a multipurpose dam as an alternative to the flood control only dam with advanced measures at Auburn, for which the Corps of Engineers is provided funding in a separate section of this bill together with direction to proceed as rapidly as possible. As of the date of this action, the Committee has not received reliable assurances that the study of a multipurpose dam, including its required environmental documentation, could be completed with a favorable recommendation or could be completed soon enough to permit Congressional authorization in fiscal year 1992.

Mormon Island Auxiliary Dam (Folsom Dam and related facilities), California.—The Committee recommendation includes $7.5 million to continue safety of dams modifications at Mormon Island Auxiliary Dam (Folsom Dam and related facilities).

Shasta Dam Temperature Control Device, California.—The Committee has included an additional $200,000 for the Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Programs, to complete the Shasta Dam Temperature Control Device Planning Report/Environmental Impact Statement, design of the project, and corresponding coordination activities.

Bostwick Irrigation District, Nebraska.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to develop plans and specifications for construction, relining, and rehabilitating certain sections of the Upper Courtland Canal, Bostwick Irrigation District.

Farwell Unit, Nebraska.—The Committee has provided an additional $270,000 to initiate construction of facilities to prevent further damage from the Farwell Unit's Sherman Dam and Reservoir in the Middle Loup Irrigation District.

Sargent Irrigation District, Nebraska.—The bill includes $200,000 to initiate rehabilitation of the irrigation distribution system of the Sargent Irrigation District. The work to be performed includes the conversion of open canal laterals to buried pipe.

Garrison Diversion Unit, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, North Dakota.—The Committee believes that to continue to fufill the commitments made to North Dakota in the Garrison Reformulation Act of 1986, the Garrison Diversion Unit should be funded at a level of $30 million in FY 91.

In keeping with the provisions of the Garrison Reformulation Act of 1986, the Committee has included $30 million for the following purposes:

[In millions of dollars]

Feature	Contracts and studies	Non-contract (administrative/ overhead)	Total
Operation and maintenace (McClusky Canal, New Rockford Canal, Snake Creek Pumping Plant, Oakes test Area)	2.47	1.15	3.62
MR&I water	17.00	.20	17.20
State	(11.00)		
Indian	(6.00)		
Indian irrigation (Fort Yates)	.47	.03	.50
Construction contracts (New Rockford Canal)	1.86	.20	2.06
Fish and wildlife facilities	4.00	.80	4.80
OM&R—Lonetree mitigation areas	(.40)		
Acquisition and development:			
Mitigation areas	(.90)		
Kraft Slough	(.50)		
Lonetree	(.60)		
Mitigation on National Wildlife Refuges	(1.60)		
Wetlands Trust Fund	1.00		1.00
Recreation	.72	.10	.82
Total	27.52	2.48	30.00

With funds provided for wildlife acquisition and development, the Committee expects that acquisition of Kraft Slough will proceed in Accordance with the Bureau's stated willing-seller policy and provisions in the Final Draft Acquisition and Development Plan. The Committee is providing $1.6 million to initiate mitigation activities on the National Wildlife Refuges impacted by the Garrison Diversion Unit developments.

In keeping with the statutory requirements of Section 11 of the Garrison Diversion Reformulation Act (P.L. 99-294), the Committee is providing five percent ($1.0 million) of the Section 10 (construction) funds for the Wetlands Trust. Transfer of these funds to the Wetlands Trust account is dependent upon execution of an agreement between the Secretary and the Governor of North Dakota regarding a contribution by the State to the Wetlands Trust equal to 10% of the Federal contribution. The Federal contribution shall be no greater than $12 million, so the State's ultimate contribution is limited to no more than $1.2 million. The Committee expects that the agreement will be executed expeditiously.

The Committee is aware of the critical problems presented by fluctuations in water levels and water quality in Devils Lake, including the threat to the lake's fishery. Within the funds provided, the Committee expects the Bureau of Reclamation to serve as a cooperating agency in the development of a Devils Lake stabilization watershed management plan by the Corps of Engineers. The

Bureau may evaluate the state reconnaisance report on Devils Lake stabilization and contribute additional data that may be useful for the completion of the Corps study.

Sulphur Pipeline, Arbuckle Project, Oklahoma.—In order to determine the potential for preserving and revitalizing the fresh and mineral springs within the Chickasaw National Recreation Area (CNRA), the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to construct a pipeline delivery system from Arbuckle Reservoir to the city of Sulphur, Oklahoma. The Committee has provided $500,000 for preconstruction work including the completion of design.

Umatilla Basin Project, Oregon.—At a hearing before the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee on the fiscal year 1990 budget, the Commissioner of Reclamation described the Umatilla Basin project as a "win-win project." In view of that assessment of the project and its broad-based support, the FY 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act included $650,000 for the project and provided direction to the Secretary of the Interior to initiate construction. However, no funds were included in the President's budget to continue this important project. Non-Federal interests are investing over $21,000,000 in the Umatilla Basin fishery restoration program. The Umatilla Basin project will provide the streamflow improvements necessary to the success of that program. Accordingly, the Committee has provided $7,052,000 to continue construction of the Umatilla Basin project. Of that total, $52,000 has been provided to allow the Bureau of Reclamation to fund a position to ensure tribal participation in implementation of the project.

Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply Project, South Dakota.—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 to continue the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply Project. The funds provided will permit the continuation of planning, engineering and design so that actual construction could begin in fiscal year 1992. The Committee expects the Bureau of Reclamation to continue to work with the Oglala Sioux Tribe and the non-Indian users of the project to develop a cooperative agreement for the project.

Columbia Basin Project, Irrigation Facilities, Washington.—The Committee has provided an additional $400,000 for the Columbia Basin Project, Irrigation Facilities, to prepare a supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement to address mitigation for anadromous fish and other concerns expressed during the public review process.

Columbia Basin Project, Third Powerplant, Washington.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 for the Columbia Basin Project, Third Powerplant, for construction of the engineering building and machine shop addition. Construction of these facilities is necessary to assure the efficient operation of the project.

Atmospheric Water Resources Management Program.—The bill includes $3,200,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation's Atmospheric Water Resources Management Program. Many parts of the Nation are in a state of prolonged drought. Precipitation management through weather modification provides the opportunity to increase water supplies without the need to construct new storage and distribution facilities. The Committee has been advised that ten states are prepared to provide matching funds so that this will be a 50/50 cost-shared program.

Bureau of Indian Affairs Safety of Dams Program—The Committee has received letters of opposition from several Tribes to the Administration's proposal to transfer the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Safety of Dams Program to the Bureau of Reclamation. Therefore, after consultation with the Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee, the Committee has decided to reject the Administration's proposal and directs the Secretary of Interior not to transfer the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Safety of Dams program to the Bureau of Reclamation.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1990	$209,315,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	231,516,000
Recommended, 1991	231,516,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+22,201,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	....

In 1991 a total of 35 projects, project areas, or divisions of projects will be operated and maintained for power, municipal and industrial water supplies, irrigation, flood control, and other benefits with funds made available under this appropriation.

Provision is also made for administration of 15 associated programs. These programs seek to maximize benefits from existing projects. Project benefits and operations will be enhanced through water conservation measures, examination of existing structures, environmental considerations, improvement of recreation opportunities, and water quality improvement.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1990	$33,644,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	5,708,000
Recommended, 1991	5,708,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−27,936,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	....

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	FY 1991 BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
LOAN PROGRAM			
MONTANA			
MIDDLE CREEK DAM REHABILITATION PROJECT...............	3,774,000	2,944,000	2,944,000
TEXAS			
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO. 1 SUPPL........	12,972,000	2,002,000	2,002,000
VARIOUS			
ADMINISTRATION OF THE LOAN PROGRAM....................	15,751,506	762,000	762,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM................................		5,708,000	5,708,000

LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS

Appropriation, 1990	($31,475,000)
Budget Estimate, 1991	(4,946,000)
Recommended, 1991	(4,946,000)
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	(−26,529,000)
Budget Estimate, 1991	(.....................)

The limitation provides a control over the principal amount of loans that may be made under the Loan Program in FY 1991.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1990	$47,311,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	51,431,000
Recommended, 1991	51,431,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+4,120,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

The general administrative expenses program provides for the executive direction and management of all reclamation activities, as performed by the Commissioner's offices in Washington, DC, and Denver, CO, and five regional offices. The Denver office and regional offices charge individual projects or activities for direct beneficial services and related administrative and technical costs. These charges are covered under other appropriations.

EMERGENCY FUND

Appropriation, 1990	$986,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	1,000,000
Recommended, 1991	1,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+14,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

This fund is used to assure continuous operations of all projects and project facilities governed by the Federal reclamation laws in the event of drought, canal bank, pipeline, or electrical facility failures; municipal and industrial water delivery system failures, or other unusual or emergency conditions.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Appropriation, 1990	$8,381,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	4,831,000
Recommended, 1991	4,831,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−3,550,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

The fund provides for more efficient financing and financial management of centralized administrative services and acquisition of the Business System Acquisition project and other capital equipment for support of Bureau programs and for work performed for others.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

McGee Creek Project, Oklahoma.—The Committee directs the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract with the McGee Creek Authority accepting a payment of $88,629,000. Upon receipt of this payment, the McGee Creek Authority's obligation under contract between the Authority and the Secretary (contract 0-07-50-X0822, dated October 11, 1979) shall be terminated. If the payment is not made by the McGee Creek Authority pursuant to the bill, the title to the McGee Creek Project shall remain with the United States.

Central Valley Project Water Marketing, California.—The Committee is aware that the Bureau is in the process of revising and reissuing for additional public comment the necessary analyses and environmental studies which would allow new, long-term contracts to be signed for approximately one million to one-and-a-half million acre-feet of water in the Central Valley Project, California.

The Committee has previously urged the Bureau to complete these studies and analyses in a timely manner. However, for the last two years the Committee has been concerned that decisions about new long-term water supply contracts not be made in isolation of other Central Valley Project water supply issues and without an opportunity for adequate review. The Committee continues to have similar concerns, and has added bill language.

The language would provide that none of the funds appropriated in this bill, or in any other Act, shall be used to execute new long-term contracts for water supply from the Central Valley Project, California.

This language would, however, direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into three water supply contracts. The first would be a municipal and industrial water supply contract with the Sacramento County Water Agency, for not to more than 22,000 acre-feet annually and a second and similar contract with the San Juan Suburban Water District, not to exceed 13,000 acre-feet annually. The annual quantities delivered under these contracts would be determined by the Secretary based upon the quantity of water immediately needed within Sacramento County after considering reasonable efforts to: (1) promote full utilization of existing water entitlements within Sacramento County, (2) implement water conservation and metering programs within the areas served by the contract, and (3) implement programs to maximize to the extent feasible conjunctive use of surface water and ground water. The contract with the Sacramento County Water Agency shall, in part, be a pass through contract for the benefit of the City of Folsom. The third contract would be a municipal and industrial water supply contract with the El Dorado County Water Agency for not more than 15,000 acre feet annually, for diversion from Folsom Lake or for exchange upstream on the Silver Fork or South Fork of the American River.

The Committee would note that these contracts are intended as the first phase of a contracting program to meet the long-term water supply needs of Sacramento and El Dorado Counties. The Secretary shall initiate the necessary analysis for the long-term water supply contracts.

Prior to entering into these contracts, the Secretary would have to comply with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act by preparing joint Environmental Impact Statements and California Environmental Quality Act Environmental Impact Reports. The Sacramento County Water Agency and the El Dorado

County Water Agency shall be the joint lead agencies with the Bureau of Reclamation in the preparation of the environmental documents for their respective counties, with the Bureau of Reclamation cooperating in all aspects of the environmental review process, but not controlling that process.

In addition, any diversions from the American River under the contract for the Sacramento County Water Agency shall, to the maximum extent reasonable and feasible, take place at or near the mouth of the American River. Diversions for the City of Folsom would, for example, be allowed from Folsom Lake.

Finally, it is the Committee's intent that no funds shall be approriated for extension of the Folsom-South Canal, Auburn-Folsom South Unit, American River Division, Central Valley Project, California unless specifically authorized by subsequent Act of Congress.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in Title III provide for Department of Energy programs relating to Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities; Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities; General Science and Research Activities; Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund; Isotope Production and Distribution Fund; Atomic Energy Defense Activities; Departmental Administration; Office of Inspector General; Power Marketing Activities; Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the Geothermal Resources Development Fund.

APPROPRIATION LANGUAGE CHANGES

The Department of Energy's budget submission for fiscal year 1991 proposes a number of changes to the appropriation language in the Fiscal Year 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. The Committee has reviewed the proposed changes and finds some of them unnecessary or undesirable. The fiscal year 1991 bill retains portions of the language used in prior years because the Committee was presented no substantive reasons to agree to the proposed changes.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS

In past reports, the Committee has expressed strong concern over the Department's repeated changes in program and appropriation structure and stated that "In the future, all structure changes shall be approved by the Committee prior to the submission of the annual budget." The Department has advised that it was unable to comply with this direction because the decision to propose several significant restructured appropriations was made late in the budget process.

The Committee has reviewed these proposed changes and does not find any compelling reason to make the restructuring. A number of restructuring proposals are discussed elsewhere in this report. The Department in making the FY 1991 changes to the budget structure, adjusted the FY 1990 appropriated amounts in the budget to make them comparable to the proposed FY 1991 structure. This technique makes it very difficult to identify the current appropriated amounts and programs. Future budget submissions should reflect the actual appropriated amounts in the same structure in which the funds were appropriated. Any changes required to make the current year comparable to the proposed budget year should be included as footnotes to the funding tables.

INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

The Committee has reviewed the Department's current policy for taxing programs to provide discretionary funding for laboratory-directed research and development projects. The amount of tax varies by laboratory and can range from 2 percent to 7 percent depending on the individual laboratory policy. While no doubt many of the projects bear very useful results, the potential for misuse of these funds is equally prevalent. These funds are being used for activities ranging from very worthwhile projects to those which appear to have limited application to DOE's mission.

In these times of severe budget constraints, the Committee is very concerned with the amount of funds spent on activities which have not been reviewed by the Department or the Congress. Due to the Committee's concern of the possible misuse of appropriated funds, the Department is directed to discontinue the general policy of allowing its multiprogram laboratories to accumulate and expend funds on laboratory-directed research and development. To preserve the prerogative to fund projects which are deemed very worthwhile, the Secretary of Energy can use the normal reprogramming authority to approve the use of funds for specific projects and activities.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1990	$2,184,449,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	2,085,237,000
Recommended, 1991	2,703,272,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+518,823,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+618,035,000

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation 1990	$1,916,768,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	1,788,606,000
Recommended, 1991	2,362,722,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+445,954,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+574,116,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation, 1990	$267,681,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	296,631,000
Recommended, 1991	340,550,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+72,869,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+43,919,000

The appropriations recommended for Energy Supply, Research and Development activities provide for all of the Department of Energy's renewable energy programs, nuclear fission and fusion, electric energy systems and energy storage, environmental, and basic energy sciences programs. These programs address the development of longer term energy supply options to provide the energy resources needed for sustained national growth and to alleviate our dependence on fossil fuels and foreign oil.

SOLAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Fiscal year 1990 appropration	$92,406,000
Fiscal year 1991 estimate	115,873,000
Fiscal year 1991 recommendation	130,430,000
Change from estimate	+14,557,000

The solar and renewable energy programs of the Department of Energy include solar buildings, photovoltaic energy systems, solar thermal energy systems, biomass, wind, solar international, technology transfer, information and program direction and support activities.

The budget request for fiscal year 1991 solar energy programs is $115,873,000, an increase of $23,467,000 from the fiscal year 1990 level.

Solar Buildings Energy Systems.—The recommendation provides $1,000,000 to continue the solar heating portion of the solar buildings program. The solar cooling, daylight research and systems integration programs are proposed to be incorporated in the conservation R&D buildings and community systems program which is funded by another subcommittee.

Photovoltaic Energy Systems.—The Committee recommendation provides $46,900,000 for the photovoltaic energy systems program.

$9,000,000 is included for a photovoltaic manufacturers initiative to resolve technical road blocks to scaled-up production of photovoltaics by U.S. companies with significant photovoltaic sales or investments in U.S. photovoltaic manufacturing equipment in 1990.

$3,000,000 is included for a utility/industry power project using monolithic amorphous silicon-photovoltaic modules, 1 meter square or larger, delivering proven stabilized efficiencies of no less than 5 percent, as certified by SERI. Once constructed, the performance, operation and maintenance of the power project should be monitored by PVUSA. $300,000 is included to assist industry in the integration of SERI tested thin film modules into the design and construction of grid-connected buildings.

The Committee directs that the Department develop a plan, in cooperation with PVUSA, the photovoltaic industry and interested utilities, to install, on a cost-shared basis, at least 50 megawatts of grid-connected, utility-scale power over the next 5 years.

Solar Thermal Energy Systems.—The Committee recommendation provides $19,500,000 for solar thermal energy systems to maintain the capability to support the continuation of solar thermal research, both in Department of Energy laboratories and in the private sector.

Biofuels Energy Systems.—The Committee recommendation provides $36,057,000 for biofuels energy research to provide for production research, short rotation intensive culture research and other activities. The recommendation includes $750,000 to continue the Hawaii Biofuels Program at the Hawaii Natural Energy Institute. The Committee allowance includes $4,500,000 for the short rotation woody crops program. The Committee has supported the management of this program by the Department's Oak Ridge National Laboratory and expects that this management authority will continue. The Committee allocates $4,200,000 to continue the regional biomass energy programs. In allocating these funds, no region should receive less than 15% of the total program funding. These regional programs should also continue to include activities related to technology transfer, industry support, resource assessment and matching local resources to conversion technologies, while noting that the existing focus on commercial direct combustion technologies should be continued.

Wind Energy Systems.—The Committee recommendation of $11,800,000 includes $2,000,000 to continue work on the Advanced Wind Turbine program (turbine size: 200–750 kW) in cooperation with the private sector. The Committee recommendation also includes $2,000,000 for a program, to be carried out in cooperation with the private sector, to seek new commercial opportunities, both domestically and internationally, for wind energy. From the total funds available for wind energy research, $1,500,000 is to be made available for the Renewable Energy Research Center program at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Other Solar Energy Activities.—The Committee recommendation provides $15,173,000 for other solar programs.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			
SOLAR ENERGY			
I. Solar applications			
A. Solar building energy systems			
Operating expenses	3,958	1,000	1,000
Capital equipment	148	---	---
Subtotal, Solar building energy systems	4,106	1,000	1,000
B. Photovoltaic energy systems			
Operating expenses	33,770	42,800	46,100
Capital equipment	887	800	800
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	34,657	43,600	46,900
C. Solar thermal energy systems			
Operating expenses	14,866	19,350	19,350
Capital equipment	148	150	150
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	15,014	19,500	19,500
D. Biofuels energy systems			
Operating expenses	15,401	27,000	35,057
Capital equipment	789	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Biofuels energy systems	16,190	28,000	36,057
E. Wind energy systems			
Operating expenses	8,930	8,400	11,600
Capital equipment	197	200	200
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	9,127	8,600	11,800
F. Ocean energy systems			
Operating expenses	3,980	---	---
Capital equipment	99	---	---
Subtotal, Ocean energy systems	4,079	---	---
Subtotal, Solar applications	83,173	100,700	115,257
II. Other solar energy			
A. International solar energy program - OE	1,028	1,500	1,500
B. Solar technology transfer			
Operating expenses	1,779	2,223	2,223
C. Solar Energy Research Institute			
Capital equipment	475	410	410
Construction:			
General plant projects	173	290	290
91-E-100 Solar energy research facility SERF.	---	4,500	4,500
Subtotal, Construction	173	4,790	4,790
Subtotal, Solar Energy Research Institute	648	5,200	5,200
D. Resource assessment			
Operating expenses	753	950	950
Capital equipment	---	50	50
Subtotal, Resource assessment	753	1,000	1,000
E. Program support - OE	879	900	900
F. Program direction - OE	4,146	4,350	4,350
Subtotal, Other solar energy	9,233	15,173	15,173
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY	92,406	115,873	130,430
(Operating expenses)	(89,490)	(108,473)	(123,030)
(Capital equipment)	(2,743)	(2,610)	(2,610)
(Construction)	(173)	(4,790)	(4,790)

GEOTHERMAL AND HYDROPOWER

Fiscal year 1990 appropriation	$18,077,000
Fiscal year 1991 estimate	19,000,000
Fiscal year 1991 recommendation	23,600,000
Change from estimate	+4,600,000

Geothermal resources include steam, hot water, geopressured methane, hot dry rock, and magma. The geothermal energy research and development program is aimed at resolving the technical problems which include uncertainties in determining size and life of reservoirs, unusually high drilling costs and lack of well stimulation techniques, the need for injection technology for economic disposal of spent brines, major corrosion and materials problems, environmental problems, and lack of efficient components.

The Committee is interested in the increasing use of geothermal heat pump technologies. These systems effectively utilize ground source energy in both residential and commercial applications. The Committee urges the Department of Energy to consider the inclusion of this technology in the development of a National Energy Strategy.

The Committee recommendation includes an increase of $4,000,000 for the conduct of long-term flow tests at Fenton Hill, New Mexico.

The recommendation provides $1,000,000 for continuation of the Magma Energy program and $4,500,000 for Reservoir Technology, not less than $2,000,000 of which shall be available for the Department to cooperate with industry efforts to maintain production at The Geysers geothermal field.

A total of $6,000,000 is provided in FY 1991 to continue the existing geopressured methane work in three field wells, Pleasant Bayou, Hulin and Gladys McCall, to be used to resolve technical issues on production of hydrocarbons and brine, and generation of electricity using the energy content of the produced fluids.

The hydropower program is supported at the Administration's request of $1,000,000.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

Fiscal year 1990 appropriation	$29,974,000
Fiscal year 1991 estimate	40,253,000
Fiscal year 1991 recommendation	41,253,000
Change from estimate	+1,000,000

The electric energy systems and storage program includes research in determining the effects of electric power transmission on humans and animals; development of technology for improving the reliability of the transmission and distribution of electricity; and research and development in systems technology and thermal and chemical storage.

The Committee recommendation of $13,906,000 for Energy Storage Systems shall include $3,600,000 for electrochemical research and battery development to be carried out at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.

The recommendation provides $3,500,000 to complete a High Phase Order electric transmission demonstration project expanding on the preliminary engineering and environmental work performed by the Department of Energy in connection with the Empire State Electric Energy Research Corporation and the New York State Electric and Gas Company.

The recommendation includes $400,000 for the next phase of a central solar heating plant with seasonal storage, to be performed at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

The allowance supports the continuation of funding for the aluminum-air battery system at the FY 1990 level of $1,050,000. In addition, $1,500,000 is included to continue the Seasonal Energy Storage program.

The Committee directs no less than $900,000 from the Energy Storage program for the development of an AC battery module advanced conversion system to be demonstrated at the existing utility DOE-funded PVUSA facility on a cost-shared basis in order to accelerate renewable energy advanced electric storage.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
GEOTHERMAL			
I. Geopressured research			
Operating expenses	5,856	2,900	6,000
II. Geothermal technology development			
Operating expenses	10,963	13,795	15,295
Capital equipment	444	405	405
Subtotal, Gebthermal technology development	11,407	14,200	15,700
III. Program direction - OE	814	900	900
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	18,077	18,000	22,600
(Operating expenses)	(17,633)	(17,595)	(22,195)
(Capital equipment)	(444)	(405)	(405)
HYDROPOWER			
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE	---	920	920
II. Program direction - OE	---	80	80
TOTAL, HYDROPOWER	---	1,000	1,000
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE			
I. Electric energy systems			
A. Electric field effects research			
Operating expenses	2,928	2,600	2,600
B. Reliability research			
Operating expenses	2,434	1,572	1,572
C. System and materials research			
Operating expenses	11,831	21,761	21,761
Capital equipment	---	900	900
Subtotal, System and materials research	11,831	22,661	22,661
D. Program direction - OE	490	514	514
Subtotal, Electric energy systems	17,683	27,347	27,347
II. Energy Storage Systems			
A. Battery storage			
Operating expenses	10,157	11,189	12,189
Capital equipment	27	300	300
Subtotal, Battery storage	10,184	11,489	12,489
B. Thermal and chemical storage			
Operating expenses	1,708	1,000	1,000
C. Program direction - OE	399	417	417
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	12,291	12,906	13,906
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE	29,974	40,253	41,253
(Operating expenses)	(29,947)	(39,053)	(40,053)
(Capital equipment)	(27)	(1,200)	(1,200)

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Fiscal year 1990 appropriation	$581,999,000
Fiscal year 1991 estimate	358,490,000
Fiscal year 1991 recommendation	313,490,000
Change from estimate	−45,000,000

Funds are included for civilian reactor research, space and defense power systems, and civilian waste research and development.

The Administration has proposed establishing a new appropriation for Environmental Restoration and Waste Management and has included approximately $420,000,000 of programs that were previously funded under nuclear. The funding for Environmental Restoration and Waste Management is discussed later in this report.

Advanced Lightwater Reactor Certification.—The Committee supports the Department's efforts to work with the electric power industry to develop and certify designs for advanced nuclear reactors with inherent safety features. The Department has committed to support light water reactor design certification work on such projects which will be shared with the electric power industry and development teams. Key elements to the viability and public acceptance of this new generation of reactors are standardization and modular construction which will make extensive use of prefabrication and assembly of components under factory conditions prior to transportation to the reactor site. Modular engineering is as essential as design certification by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission since it will provide certainty that reactors can be built on time and within budget. The Committee understands the vendor teams involved are willing to pay back Federal funds invested in modular and first-time engineering costs from royalties based on the plants built as a result of these efforts. The Committee urges the Department to evaluate the need for Federal funding of first-time engineering and to make a recommendation as part of its FY 1992 budget request.

The Committee continues to be concerned about the future of the nuclear power option in the United States. The strategic plan for the nuclear reactor research and development program remains unfinished, and the program appears to lack focus and direction. The budget proposal for civilian nuclear research remains heavily skewed toward space and defense activities, and facility mortgages consume a significant portion of the remaining resources.

The Committee supports the Department's participation with industry to develop a reactor life extension plan and the development of standard reactor designs certified by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for construction and operation.

The Committee has received testimony in support of the concept of testing actinide burning in the Fast Flux Test Facility in Richland, Washington. This concept involves the transmutation of long-lived radioactive actinides into short half-life isotopes in a liquid metal reactor. The Committee has been advised that this concept could have application to the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management program and has funded the FY 1991 operation of the Fast Flux Test Reactor in that account.

Advanced Reactor Research and Development.—The recommendation provides a total of $47,000,000 for advanced reactor R&D. The allowance includes $3,500,000 for the continuation of the funding for the University Research Program in Robotics for Advanced Reactors at a minimum level of $3,500,000.

The Committee recommendation includes $3,700,000 for Civilian Radioactive Waste Research and Development, $3,000,000 of which shall be available for the Department of Energy to pursue a cooperative research, development and demonstration project of Spent Nuclear Fuel Dual Purpose (Storage and Transportation) Casks. Current Dry Cask Storage programs call for fuel handling several times between plant in-pool storage, dry storage, transportation and ultimate disposal. Development and demonstration of a dual-purpose cask can help minimize this handling by reducing the number of transfers required. The Committee agrees with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that radiation exposure and other handling risks should be minimized in the entire process from original removal of the fuel from the reactor pool through its ultimate disposal. Development of dual-purpose casks can help reduce these handling risks and thereby enhance public health and safety. It is the Committee's intent that this project be carried out in cooperation with a west coast utility which has a nuclear reactor prematurely shut down due to a citizen's initiative and has an immediate need for development of dual-purpose cask storage for timely removal of spent fuel to simplify repowering options.

The Committee has previously raised questions about the Department's progress in testing, evaluating and seeking to improve radioactive waste canister technologies in order to minimize public health and safety risks to the fullest extent. The Committee understands that attention is now being given by various laboratories and facilities to the availability of using a seamless deep drawn canister technology that could further reduce potential risks associated with seam and weld stresses, as well as reduce costs required to detect weld weaknesses. The Committee is encouraged by such developments and requests a report from the Department, by December 31, 1990, on its overall canister design programs for handling both defense and commercial radioactive waste, including planned activities and resource requirements for the application of seamless deep drawn technologies.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
NUCLEAR			
I. Nuclear energy R & D			
A. Light water reactor			
Operating expenses	24,423	31,500	31,500
B. Advanced reactor R & D			
Operating expenses	56,784	45,000	45,000
Capital equipment	1,972	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Advanced reactor R & D	58,756	47,000	47,000
C. Space & defense power systems			
Operating expenses	21,623	38,040	38,040
Capital equipment	2,426	2,160	2,160
Construction:			
86-N-105 SP-100 fac. mods - HEDL	7,298	14,300	14,300
Subtotal, Space & defense power systems	31,347	54,500	54,500
D. Advanced nuclear systems			
Operating expenses	29,777	55,500	55,500
Capital equipment	3,944	6,400	6,400
Construction:			
89-N-111 RPSF	15,319	13,600	13,600
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems	49,040	75,500	75,500
E. Facilities			
Operating expenses	161,191	131,078	83,078
Capital equipment	4,043	2,300	2,300
Construction:			
91-E-201 Modification to reactors	---	2,200	2,200
GPN-102 GPP	3,648	3,012	3,012
90-N-202 Mod to reactors	5,177	---	---
39-N-115 Fire suf. imp., ANL	1,726	1,900	1,900
Subtotal, Construction	10,551	4,912	4,912
Subtotal, Facilities	175,785	140,490	92,490
F. Program direction - OE	8,677	8,800	8,800
Subtotal, Nuclear energy R & D	348,028	357,790	309,790
(Operating expenses)	(302,475)	(309,918)	(261,918)
(Capital equipment)	(12,385)	(12,860)	(12,860)
(Construction)	(33,168)	(35,012)	(35,012)
II. Remedial actions and waste technology			
A. Formerly utilized sites			
Operating expenses	14,544	---	---
Capital equipment	99	---	---
Subtotal, Formerly utilized sites	14,643	---	---
B. Uranium program mill tailings			
Operating expenses	92,783	---	---
Capital equipment	986	---	---
Subtotal, Uranium program mill tailings	93,769	---	---
C. Surplus facilities			
Operating expenses	28,791	---	---
Capital equipment	493	---	---
Subtotal, Surplus facilities	29,284	---	---
D. West valley			
Operating expenses	87,387	---	---
E. Low level waste			
Operating expenses	4,815	---	---
F. Waste technology and by-products			
Operating expenses	532	---	---
G. Program direction - OE	2,564	---	---
Subtotal, Remedial actions and waste technology	232,994	---	---

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
III. Civilian waste R & D			
A. Spent fuel storage R & D			
Operating expenses	780	590	3,590
B. Program direction	197	110	110
Subtotal, Civilian waste R & D	977	700	3,700
TOTAL, NUCLEAR	581,999	358,490	313,490
(Operating expenses)	(534,868)	(310,618)	(265,618)
(Capital equipment)	(13,963)	(12,860)	(12,860)
(Construction)	(33,168)	(35,012)	(35,012)

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

Fiscal year 1990 appropriation	$111,961,000
Fiscal year 1991 estimate	97,421,000
Fiscal year 1991 recommendation	97,421,000
Change from estimate	

The Environment, Safety and Health (ES&H) program was established to assure protection of the environment, safety of DOE workers and the public, and protection of DOE property. The ES&H program implements these goals by defining DOE policy, providing guidance and technical assistance, performing safety related research of a generic nature and performing independent overview and assessment.

LIQUEFIED GASEOUS FUELS SPILL TEST FACILITY

The Committee provides $1,085,000 to continue to provide baseline operations support for facility maintenance and technical interaction with potential sponsors of research.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Fiscal year 1990 appropriation	$313,987,000
Fiscal year 1991 estimate	338,794,000
Fiscal year 1991 recommendation	371,394,000
Change from estimate	+32,600,000

This program has two main objectives: (1) to develop the knowledge base necessary to identify, understand and anticipate the long-term health and environmental consequences of energy use and development; and (2) to utilize the Department's unique scientific and technological capabilities to solve major scientific problems in medicine and biology.

The Committee recommendation provides $68,900,000 for Carbon Dioxide Research, including $9,000,000 for the National Institute of Global Environmental Change. The National Institute is an important, independent research and educational resource for the Department of Energy that marshalls America's premier academic talent to measure climactic trends, to assess risks and develop risk assessment skills, to propose options for mitigating change, and for adapting energy strategies to new environmental conditions. The four academic research institutions which make up the National Institute shall draw upon the scholarly resources in their region of the country to serve the Department's interests. The funds allocated to the Institute shall be apportioned among the regions and to the overall management of the Institute.

The Committee recommendation for Biological and Environmental Research includes $13,500,000 for the Boron Neutron Capture Therapy program. Of these funds, $6,000,000 is available for the Boron Neutron Capture Therapy research program and $7,500,000 is available for modification and operation of the Power Burst Facility located at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory.

From the total funds available, the Committee provides $8,000,000 for equipment to support a demonstration pediatric Positron Emission Tomography (PET) scan at Children's Hospital in Detroit, Michigan. There are approximately two dozen PET scanners in use in the United States today, all in adult settings, using

DOE-developed technology. However, there is no PET scan dedicated to the diagnosis and research of pediatric conditions, despite the fact that children under age 15 make up nearly one-fourth of our nation's population.

The Committee is impressed with the research sponsored by the Department to examine the effectiveness of heavy ions for treating cancerous tumors. The program has shown that heavy ions can be used successfully to treat specific types of tumors that are otherwise less effectively treated by conventional radiation. Research is continuing on the broader use of heavy ions for the treatment of other kinds of tumors. In order for both the research and the medical applications of this work to continue into the next century, dedicated facilities may be needed. The Committee, therefore, directs the Department to request a study by the National Academy of Sciences on the future facility needs for applying heavy ions to medical treatment research.

The Committee has included $2,100,000 to acquire a 6-MEV linear accelerator and necessary installation and space modification to locate a cancer treatment unit at the Misericordia Hospital in Philadelphia.

The Committee recommendation increases the funding for the Division of Energy Biosciences' competitive grants for biological research by $5,000,000 for a new total of $25,000,000.

Center of Excellence for Laser Medical Applications.—The Committee has learned of new opportunities and recent developments in the area of laser medical applications. Innovative medical applications of laser energy, such as wound healing or kidney and gall stone lithotripsy are providing new and cost effective approaches to medical care. Laser technology has enabled many invasive procedures to become non-invasive; inpatient procedures have become out-patient procedures; treatments are less dangerous and less costly; and hospital stays have been reduced and repeated hospitalizations eliminated.

Examples of areas where effective laser research and applications can make a difference are in the 1,500,000 people who annually have heart attacks; 2,000,000 people suffer from kidney stones and gall bladder attacks; the 2,000,000 Americans suffering from glaucoma with 80,000 going blind; over 2,000,000 Americans annually will seek treatment for burns; or the fastest growing form of cancer, skin cancer with 600,000 new cases per year. Today, these are all treatable in one form or another with lasers. Yet, these diseases take a terrible emotional and financial toll on Americans every year.

The Committee feels that any research which can advance the diagnosis and treatment of major diseases should be encouraged and developed. As a result, the Committee recommends that this new technology, which has the potential for enhancing the quality of medical care should be explored and developed by establishing Centers of Excellence for Laser Medical Applications.

The Committee recommends that up to two hospital-based, multidisciplinary medical university demonstration projects be established as Centers of Excellence for Laser Medical Application. Funds to provide for up to $750,000 to each Center for planning and development costs have been provided, and the Committee expects a report no later than 120 days following the enactment of this bill detailing funding plans, and overview of a program to carry out the use of this very hopeful, innovative and cost effective technology.

Facilities.—The Committee recommendation includes the following new facilities. The maximum Federal contribution is to be no greater than $10,000,000 which is to be cost-shared with the institution. The Federal contribution is to be used only for facility construction and shall represent not more than 50 percent of the total construction cost. The Federal contribution shall not be available for equipment or operating expenses. The following facilities are included from within funds available in Biological and Environmental Research.

Biomedical Research Facility at the University of Alabama at Birmingham

The Committee directs that $10,000,000 be made available in support of this $27,700,000 facility. The facility will house a range of biomedical research programs; these will include biomedical imaging and spectroscopy, crystallography and structural biochemistry, genetics, and human condition-related research on neural functions, AIDS, cancer and human genetic disorders.

Biomedical Research Facility, Case Western Reserve University

The bill includes $10,000,000 in support of $60,000,000 of a biomedical research facility at Case Western Reserve University. This facility would allow Case Western to strengthen its research activities on the health of the elderly; viral diseases, such as AIDS, multiple sclerosis, and cancer; and inherited diseases, such as sickle cell anemia and diabetes.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
I. Environment, safety and health			
Operating expenses	108,904	95,879	95,879
Capital equipment	3,057	1,542	1,542
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	111,961	97,421	97,421
LIQUIFIED GASEOUS SPILL TEST FACILITY			
I. Spill test facility			
Operating expenses	1,025	1,085	1,085
BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH			
I. Biological and environmental research			
Operating expenses	274,645	317,888	350,488
Capital equipment	11,635	11,621	11,621
Construction:			
GP-E-120 General plant projects	3,451	3,485	3,485
90-R-800 LSU Medical School, LA	9,860	---	---
88-R-124 Oregon Health Science Univ., OR	9,860	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	23,171	3,485	3,485
II. Program direction	4,536	5,800	5,800
TOTAL, BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	313,987	338,794	371,394
(Operating expenses)	(279,181)	(323,688)	(356,288)
(Capital equipment)	(11,635)	(11,621)	(11,621)
(Construction)	(23,171)	(3,485)	(3,485)

MAGNETIC FUSION

Fiscal year 1990 appropriation	$323,018,000
Fiscal year 1991 estimate	325,300,000
Fiscal year 1991 recommendation	325,300,000
Change from estimate	

The goal of this program is to establish the scientific and technological base required for achieving magnetic fusion energy. The target for completion of magnetic fusion development is determined by the present technical, economic, and political uncertainties of energy supply. Given timescales for the resolution of these uncertainties, it follows that the scientific and technological base for fusion should be essentially available by the turn of the century.

The Committee is concerned about the course and progress of the fusion research program. The date that magnetic fusion might become a commercial reality continues to be extended. The Committee is concerned about this very long-term commitment and the vast amount of funding necessary to prove the scientific feasibility of fusion.

The Committee has been advised of the Department's efforts to perform a high-level review of the goals and mission of the magnetic fusion program. The Committee is very supportive of this effort, however, the results of the review will not be available until this fall.

The Committee recommends that the Department focus its research activities in a scientifically oriented program. The Committee agrees with the Department's request to defer the construction of the Compact Ignition Tokamak. The Department should concentrate its efforts on continuation of research and experiments on the existing facilities to better understand the future of the program.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

($ in thousands)

FUSION

I. Magnetic fusion			
A. Confinement systems	323,018	163,050	163,050
B. Development and technology	---	48,060	48,060
C. Applied plasma physics	---	70,880	70,880
D. Planning and projects	---	4,250	4,250
E. Program direction - OE	---	5,650	5,650
F. Capital equipment	---	14,310	14,310
G. Construction			
GPP-900 General plant projects	---	8,000	8,000
89-R-800 Confinement physics res facility	---	11,100	11,100
Subtotal, Construction	---	19,100	19,100
TOTAL, FUSION	323,018	325,300	325,300
(Operating expenses)	(323,018)	(291,890)	(291,890)
(Capital equipment)	---	(14,310)	(14,310)
(Construction)	---	(19,100)	(19,100)

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

Fiscal year 1990 appropriation	$671,219,000
Fiscal year 1991 estimate	715,042,000
Fiscal year 1991 recommendation	770,635,000
Change from estimate	+55,593,000

The Administration requested $715,042,000 for supporting research and technical analysis which includes Basic Energy Sciences, Energy Oversight and Multiprogram Facility Support. The Committee recommendation provides $770,635,000 and makes the following adjustments.

University Research Support.—Since 1981, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ana G. Mendez Educational Foundation and Jackson State University have enjoyed a productive relationship intended to enhance computer science and scientific research at all three institutions. The Committee is encouraged by the success of this effort and directs the Department to provide $2,500,000 in FY 1991 to maintain and support this relationship.

The Committee allowance includes $12,000,000 to continue the research and development and preliminary engineering leading to an Advanced Neutron Source at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Within available funds of the Department of Energy, $5,000,000 shall be made available for the Advanced Technology Research Center at Oklahoma State University. The funds will support the Center's research and technology transfer programs in the areas of automated design, manufacturing, intelligent machines, web handling, materials processing, high performance computing, energy conservation, storage and conversion, synthetic fuels, and biomass conversion.

From within the total funds available, the Committee recommendation includes $5,700,000 in equipment funds to support development of the Nebraska Centers for Science and Technology at the University of Nebraska. The Nebraska Centers for Science and Technology provide for the development of program and facilities designed to coordinate and focus proven strengths in plant and animal sciences, process technologies and the application of a systems approach to problem solving. The Centers will bring into a single cooperative setting the resources of three academic areas: biotechnology, biochemistry and chemical engineering. Activities of the Centers will include research, development and the transfer of new products, processes and technologies to private industry in agriculture, medicine, energy and the environment.

Midwest Superconductivity Consortium.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 to continue the Midwest Superconductivity Consortium headquartered at Purdue University. Initiated last year, this regional alliance uses a competitive review to identify and fund work on superconductivity and related materials and processes. The Committee believes that the Consortium is a crucial part of the U.S. pursuit of superconductivity applications.

Facilities.—The Committee recommendation includes the following new facilities. The maximum Federal contribution is to be no greater than $10,000,000 which is to be cost-shared with the institution. The Federal contribution is to be used only for facility construction and shall represent not more than 50 percent of the total construction cost. The Federal contribution shall not be available for equipment or operating expenses. The following facilities are included in the material sciences program in Basic Energy Sciences:

Advanced Technology Center, Indiana State University

The bill includes $4,842,500 for the design and construction of an Advanced Technology Center at Indiana State University. The construction is necessary for Indiana State to meet the facility demand created by the expanding technology programs at the university.

University of New Orleans Center for Energy Resources Management

The bill includes $10,000,000 for a new facility to anchor a research park adjacent to the campus. The $10,000,000 in Federal support will be a part of the total cost to be invested by the University, the State of Louisiana and private investors in the research initiative. As an integrated research facility, the park will provide a high technology concentration with areas of specialization—including energy, materials, computational sciences, biotechnology, biomedicine, environmental management and satellite and ocean modelling. Each area complements the central research that will be conducted as part of the research and technology transfer center.

Energy Science Research Facility at Boston College

The bill includes $10,000,000 as the Federal matching share for the construction of a $36,450,000 facility to house the National Center for the Advanced Study of Catalysis-Based Energy Science. The development of advanced concepts in catalysis and their application to energy related problems is crucial to the future strength and vitality of the United States and its energy and technology-based industries. Establishment of the Center will create a prime research and training facility to promote and conduct advanced research projects on catalysis over the broad spectrum of chemical disciplines with special emphasis on improving energy efficiency and management.

Educational Grants.—The Committee recommendation provides that from within the Department's expanding education programs not less than $2,000,000 shall be available for EPSCoR planning grants and $2,000,000 for Graduate Traineeship EPSCoR funding.

University Research Support.—The Committee recommendation provides $10,000,000 to be made available, on a competitive basis, to university nuclear engineering programs. These monies are to be made available for graduate fellowships, direct research support, and educational support programs in the field of nuclear engineering.

The Committee provides $1,000,000 to ensure that a significant university reactor upgrade program will be continued. It is the desire of the Committee to address the pressing question of research reactor modernization through this funding.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS			
I. Basic energy sciences			
A. Materials sciences	203,257	221,954	266,547
B. Chemical sciences	144,107	150,500	150,500
C. Applied mathematical sciences	43,705	47,975	47,975
D. Engineering and geosciences	33,204	32,500	32,500
E. Advanced energy projects	14,591	24,000	24,000
F. Energy biosciences	20,647	20,200	20,200
G. Program direction - OE	5,374	6,500	6,500
H. Capital equipment	37,061	37,019	37,019
I. Construction			
91-E-314 AID	---	6,965	6,965
GPE-400 General plant projects	5,510	3,069	3,069
90-R-401 AIP	4,536	---	---
90-R-402 Partial decon. and protective storage of ANL CP-5 research reactor	986	---	---
89-R-402 6-7 GeV Syn. Radiation Source	39,440	75,000	75,000
88-R-403 3 GeV Spear Injector, SSRL	4,437	---	---
87-R-406 1-2 GeV Synch Rad Sc, LBL	25,636	23,000	23,000
Subtotal, Construction	80,545	108,034	108,034
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences	582,491	648,682	693,275
(Operating expenses)	(464,885)	(503,629)	(548,222)
(Capital equipment)	(37,061)	(37,019)	(37,019)
(Construction)	(80,545)	(108,034)	(108,034)
II. Energy oversight, research analy. and Univ support			
A. Energy research analysis - OE	3,800	3,883	3,883
B. University research support - OE			
Operating expenses:			
1. University reactor fuel assistance	3,071	7,230	7,230
2. Laboratory Coop Science Education Ctrs	16,903	18,230	29,230
3. University program	2,722	1,900	1,900
4. R & D laboratory tech transfer	2,219	2,400	2,400
Subtotal, University research support	24,915	29,760	40,760
C. Advisory and oversight - OE	3,326	4,250	4,250
D. University research instrumentation	4,930	4,924	4,924
Subtotal, Energy oversight, res analy, and Univ sup	36,971	42,817	53,817

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
III. Multiprogram energy laboratories - facility sup			
A. Multiprogram general purpose facilities			
Construction:			
90-R-100 Trans. Fac. Replacement, ANL.......	345	1,400	1,400
90-R-121 Rehab fire, water, pumping and storage systems, ANL........................	148	1,000	1,000
90-R-107 Boiler Replacement, BNL............	319	3,196	3,196
90-R-108 Ctrl. Shops Alteration & Add., BNL.	306	1,370	1,370
90-R-109 Building Addition, BNL.............	1,676	---	---
90-R-110 Instrumentation Sup. Lab. Rehab, LB	197	1,800	1,800
90-R-111 Original Labsite Substation, LBL...	247	2,400	2,400
90-R-112 Measurements and Controls Support Facility, ORNL......................	884	3,100	3,100
90-R-113 Elec. Syst. Upgrade, ORNL..........	843	1,445	1,445
90-R-115 Laboratory & Sanitary Sewer Collection System Rehab., ANL..............	493	---	---
90-R-116 Hazardous Waste Management Projects, BNL...............................	158	---	---
90-R-117 Slope/Seismic Stabilization, LBL...	493	2,200	2,200
90-R-118 Fire Protection Upgrade, ORNL......	1,321	1,960	1,960
90-R-119 Sanitary Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements, ANL.....................	493	---	---
89-R-102 Fire Protection III, BNL...........	2,322	---	---
89-R-108 roads and parking rehab , ORNL.....	858	---	---
89-R-111 Building utilities, PNL............	2,138	---	---
89-R-112 Replace PCB Transformers, ANL......	1,361	---	---
89-R-113 Environmental Upgrades, BNL........	3,215	---	---
88-R-805 Environmental improvements, BNL....	1,468	---	---
88-R-806 Environmental health & safety project, LBL................................	4,769	1,612	1,612
88-R-807 Electrical system rehab, ANL.......	2,662	860	860
88-R-812 Hazardous waste handling fac, LBL..	1,331	---	---
87-R-753 Rehabilitate Laboratory Space (Building 200), ANL.........................	2,574	1,800	1,800
87-R-756 Waterline Replacement, ANL.........	529	---	---
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)...	393	---	---
Subtotal, Multiprogram general purpose facilities	31,544	23,743	23,743

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
B. Environmental compliance			
Operating expenses	8,874	---	---
Construction:			
90-R-770 GPP	986	---	---
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade, ORNL	10,353	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	11,339	---	---
Subtotal, Environmental compliance	20,213	---	---
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy laboratories - fac sup.	51,757	23,743	23,743
(Operating expenses)	(8,874)	---	---
(Construction)	(42,883)	(23,743)	(23,743)
TOTAL, SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS	671,219	715,042	770,635
(Operating expenses)	(510,730)	(546,246)	(601,839)
(Capital equipment)	(37,061)	(37,019)	(37,019)
(Construction)	(123,428)	(131,777)	(131,777)
POLICY AND MANAGEMENT			
I. Policy and management			
A. Policy and management - ER	665	850	850
B. Policy and management - NE	2,169	32,921	32,921
C. Policy and management - CE	1,541	1,668	1,668
TOTAL, POLICY AND MANAGEMENT	4,375	35,439	35,439
ENERGY APPLICATIONS			
I. Technical information management program			
Operating expenses	13,656	14,100	25,100
Capital equipment	937	900	900
Construction	197	---	---
Subtotal, Technical information management program	14,790	15,000	26,000
II. In-house energy management			
Operating expenses	1,992	3,540	3,540
Construction:			
90-A-601 Modifications for energy mgmt	15,244	17,000	17,000
90-A-602 Convert Boiler No. 4 (ANL)	2,238	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	17,482	17,000	17,000
Subtotal, In-house energy management	19,474	20,540	20,540
III. Strategic facilities utilization program			
Operating expenses	1,949	---	---
Construction:			
GP-A-101 Excess facilities - GPP	195	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Strategic facilities utilization program	2,144	3,000	3,000
TOTAL, ENERGY APPLICATIONS	36,408	38,540	49,540

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT (NON-DEFENSE)

Fiscal year 1990 appropriation	
Fiscal year 1991 estimate	
Fiscal year 1991 recommendation	$563,685,000
Change from estimate	+563,685,000

As discussed elsewhere in this report, the Administration has proposed that a number of activities providing for environmental restoration and waste management be combined into a single appropriation. The Committee has no objection to the combination of these activities under a single manager, but does not recommend combining the defense and civilian work under a single appropriation. Accordingly, the Committee has included the civilian program proposed by the Administration under the Energy Supply, Research and Development appropriation and the defense program under the Atomic Energy Defense appropriation.

The Committee action recommends $563,685,000 which increases the proposed non-defense program by $134,000,000. This increase will provide for the full-year operation of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) and allow research to continue on a number of programs including research on actinide burning. The Committee remains concerned, however, about the long-term future missions for FFTF. For this reason, the Committee supports the efforts of a commercialization team assembled by the Governor of Washington State that is currently working to identify private sources who are willing to contribute to the operating costs of FFTF in exchange for valuable industrial and medical isotopes and irradiation services. It is anticipated that this marketing approach, over time, will help defray the Federal operating costs of the FFTF. The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $5,200,000 for the Environmental and Molecular Sciences Laboratory.

The Committee strongly urges the Department to expedite the program for environmental restoration and waste management, and has recommended a $25,000,000 increase in the environmental restoration program and $25,000,000 to the waste management program.

GENERAL REDUCTION

The Committee has increasing concerns with regard to the use of Independent Research and Development by the laboratories. During this period of tight fiscal constraints, the laboratories should restrict their programs to activities specifically identified in the budget and appropriation reports. Accordingly, the Committee recommends a $20,000,000 general reduction to be applied to the Independent Research and Development funding that was to be made available to the laboratories.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are summarized in the following table:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT (NON-DEFENSE)			
I. Corrective activities			
A. Nuclear energy			
Operating expenses	---	---	809
Construction:			
GP-D-171 General plant project	---	---	442
91-E-203 SCTI waste water disposal system	---	---	2,861
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	3,303
Subtotal, Nuclear energy	---	---	4,112
B. Energy research			
Operating expenses	---	---	2,756
Construction:			
GP-D-171 General plant proj, various locations	---	---	5,080
91-E-307 800 Area landfill leachate (ANL)	---	---	250
91-E-304 Sanit. wastewater treatment upgrade	---	---	400
90-R-115 Laboratory and sanitary sewer collection system rehab (ANL)	---	---	1,000
90-R-116 Hazardous waste mgmt proj (BNL)	---	---	2,240
90-R-119 Sanitary wastewater treatment plant improvements (ANL)	---	---	3,310
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade (ORNL)	---	---	7,913
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	20,193
Subtotal, Energy research	---	---	22,949
Subtotal, Corrective activities	---	---	27,061
(Operating expenses)	---	---	(3,565)
(Construction)	---	---	(23,496)
II. Environmental restoration			
Operating expenses:			
1. Facilities and sites	---	---	106,106
2. Formerly utilized sites, remedial action projects	---	---	35,200
3. Uranium program mill tailings, remedial action projects	---	---	124,500
4. Uranium mill tailings, groundwater restoration project	---	---	1,000
Subtotal, Operating expenses	---	---	266,806
Construction:			
90-R-402 Storage of the ANL CP-5 reactor	---	---	4,400
89-R-113 Environmental upgrades, BNL	---	---	3,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	7,400
Subtotal, Environmental restoration	---	---	274,206
(Operating expenses)	---	---	(266,806)
(Construction)	---	---	(7,400)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
III. Waste management			
Operating expenses:			
1. Waste operations	---	---	135,290
2. West valley	---	---	90,000
3. Low level waste	---	---	11,500
Subtotal, Operating expenses	---	---	236,790
Capital equipment	---	---	786
Construction:			
GP-D-171 General plant projects	---	---	3,567
91-E-322 Building compliance	---	---	1,800
91-E-305 Waste minimization fac. upgrade, BNL	---	---	500
91-E-306 Haz waste treatment fac, PNL	---	---	970
89-R-111 Building utilities, PNL	---	---	200
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	7,037
Subtotal, Waste management	---	---	244,613
(Operating expenses)	---	---	(236,790)
(Capital equipment)	---	---	(786)
(Construction)	---	---	(7,037)
IV. Technology development			
Operating expenses	---	---	500
Construction:			
91-EM-100 Environmental and molecular science laboratory at Richland	---	---	5,200
Subtotal, Technology development	---	---	5,700
V. Program direction	---	---	24,106
Program slippage	---	---	-12,000
TOTAL, ENVIRON RESTOR AND WASTE MGMT (NON-DEFENSE)	---	---	563,685
(Operating expenses)	---	---	(519,766)
(Capital equipment)	---	---	(786)
(Construction)	---	---	(43,133)
General reduction	---	---	-20,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,184,449	2,096,237	2,703,272
(Operating expenses)	(1,916,768)	(1,799,606)	(2,352,722)
(Capital equipment)	(69,867)	(82,467)	(83,253)
(Construction)	(197,814)	(214,164)	(267,297)

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1990	
Budget Estimate, 1991	$2,791,436,000
Recommended, 1991	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	
Budget Estimate, 1991	−2,791,436,000

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1990	
Budget Estimate, 1991	$2,251,542,000
Recommended, 1991	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	
Budget Estimate, 1991	−2,251,542,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation, 1990	
Budget Estimate, 1991	$539,894,000
Recommended, 1991	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	
Budget Estimate, 1991	−539,894,000

This is a new account proposed by the Administration this year for activities historically funded in the Atomic Energy Defense Activities account and in the Energy Supply, Research and Development account. For the reasons stated in the initial portion of Title III of this report, the Committee rejected this proposed account structure and chose to continue to use the same structure as in fiscal year 1990. Accordingly, the Committee's recommendations for activities proposed in Environmental Restoration and Waste Management are included in the Atomic Energy Defense Activities and Energy Supply, Research and Development accounts.

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1990	$1,412,437,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	1,406,018,000
Recommended, 1991	1,406,018,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−6,419,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

REVENUES

Appropriation, 1990	1,500,900,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	1,530,500,000
Recommended, 1991	1,530,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−29,600,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

The budget proposed by the Administration assumes the enactment of legislation to create a United States Uranium Enrichment Corporation, a wholly owned Government corporation. The corporation would be responsible for maintaining a domestic source of enrichment services.

The proposed authorizing legislation has not been enacted. Accordingly, the Committee has recommended an appropriation, offset by revenues, to the Department of Energy in the same manner as in previous years. The Committee reiterates its position that any proposal on the part of the Department to transfer any part or all of the enrichment enterprise to another entity for the purpose of providing enrichment services requires the prior enactment of enabling legislation.

The appropriation recommended for Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities provides for uranium enrichment production, Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation (AVLIS) research and development, and related support activities. In this account, revenues received through the sale of enrichment services are used to offset costs incurred by the Department in providing these services. The total recommended appropriation for fiscal year 1991 is $1,406,018,000. Revenues are estimated at $1,530,500,000 which are to be used to offset the FY 1991 appropriation.

Gaseous Diffusion Operations and Support.—The recommendation for this activity is $1,155,600,000, of which $1,077,700,000 is for operating expenses and $77,900,000 is for equipment and construction activities. The budget proposes the production of approximately 6.0 million separative work units (SWU) in FY 1991.

Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation.—The recommendation for this activity is $154,500,000, of which $146,500,000 is for operating expenses and $8,000,000 is for capital equipment and construction. The Committee is concerned with the funding level proposed and encourages the Department to take every action to expedite the schedule to conduct a research, development and demonstration program to provide the data needed to make an intelligent deployment decision at the earliest reasonable date.

Revenues.—In the Fiscal Year 1987 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Congress reserved to itself the authority to determine the level of any unrecouped costs that must be returned to the Treasury in future legislation. To date, the Congress has not made such a determination. Accordingly, the recommended appropriation does not approve debt repayment and employs appropriation language which applies estimated fiscal year 1991 revenues to offset the recommended appropriations. Any revenues collected in fiscal year 1991 in excess of the amount needed to fully offset appropriations shall remain in the uranium enrichment account until transferred or otherwise redirected in legislation.

The Administration has proposed legislation in the appropriation language that would allow the Department of Energy to purchase enrichment services at prices below the Department's cost of production and establish a new decontamination and decommissioning fund. The Committee recommendation does not include the proposed legislation and urges that these provisions be considered during the deliberation on the proposed legislation establishing a United States Uranium Enrichment Corporation.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current estimates and the budget request are shown in the following table:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
URANIUM ENRICHMENT			
I. Uranium enrichment activities			
A. Gaseous diffusion operations and support			
Operating expenses	1,168,937	1,077,700	1,077,700
Capital equipment	9,670	15,700	15,700
Construction:			
91-U-200 Replace capacitors, GDP, Paducah	---	4,000	4,000
91-U-201 Refurbish int. purge fac., GDP, Ports	---	1,400	1,400
91-U-207 Roof upgrading, GDP, Portsmouth	---	3,800	3,800
91-U-208 S & S upgrading, GDP, Portsmouth	---	3,500	3,500
91-U-209 Proc inv ctrl sys Phase II, GDP, Port	---	3,800	3,800
90-N-501 Cooling tower mods	296	8,700	8,700
GP-N-501 GPP	---	12,600	12,600
GP-N-502 General plant projects	8,192	---	---
89-N-501 UF6 cylinders	5,823	10,100	10,100
88-N-502 Process inventory control system, Pad	24,876	8,300	8,300
87-N-502 Cooling tower upgrade, GDP, Paducah	---	2,000	2,000
82-N-413 Improved UF6 containment	7,501	4,000	4,000
Subtotal, Construction	46,688	62,200	62,200
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion operations and support	1,225,295	1,155,600	1,155,600
B. Atomic vapor laser isotope separation			
Operating expenses	123,280	146,800	146,800
Capital equipment	7,995	5,600	5,600
Construction:			
GP-N-600 General plant projects	988	2,400	2,400
Subtotal, Atomic vapor laser isotope separation	132,263	154,800	154,800
C. Corrective action - environment			
Operating expenses	---	3,750	3,750
Construction:			
91-U-206 Reduction of PCB contamination	---	5,500	5,500
Subtotal, Corrective action - environment	---	9,250	9,250
D. Environmental restoration			
Operating expenses	49,845	67,419	67,419
E. Waste management			
Operating expenses	---	10,304	10,304
Capital equipment	---	2,945	2,945
Construction:			
GP-N-210 General plant projects	---	700	700
Subtotal, Waste management	---	13,949	13,949
F. Program direction - OE	5,034	5,300	5,300
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities	1,412,437	1,406,018	1,406,018
(Operating expenses)	(1,347,096)	(1,310,973)	(1,310,973)
(Capital equipment)	(17,665)	(24,245)	(24,245)
(Construction)	(47,676)	(70,800)	(70,800)
Revenues	-1,500,900	-1,530,500	-1,530,500
TOTAL URANIUM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	-88,463	-124,482	-124,482
(Operating expenses)	(-153,804)	(-219,527)	(-219,527)
(Capital equipment)	(17,665)	(24,245)	(24,245)
(Construction)	(47,676)	(70,800)	(70,800)

General Science and Research Activities

Appropriation, 1990	$1,098,829,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	1,273,732,000
Recommended, 1991	1,273,732,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+174,903,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1990	$737,566,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	829,634,000
Recommended, 1991	829,634,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+92,068,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation, 1990	$361,263,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	444,098,000
Recommended, 1991	444,098,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+82,835,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

The General Science programs are concerned with understanding the nature of matter and energy and the fundamental forces and particles of nature. The knowledge acquired in this basic research is an essential part of the intellectual foundation of other scientific disciplines and technical pursuits. Deeper understanding correspondingly contributes, sometimes in spectacular ways, to all of the scientific disciplines and to our Nation's technological base. The General Science programs are organized into two interrelated scientific programs, High Energy Physics and Nuclear Physics. While these programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near or mid-term, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization and on other aspects of our society.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The committee recommendation for High Energy Physics totals $621,187,000 which is equal to the Administration's budget request and is an increase of $34,536,000 compared to FY 1990.

The Committee continues to support the increase in the budget for full operation of existing facilities. These facilities need to be operated to the fullest extent possible to achieve the scientific output for which they were justified.

SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

The Committee recommendation includes funds for continued construction of the Superconducting Super Collider (SSC). The Department of Energy recently requested that the State of Texas begin acquiring the approximately 17,000 acres of land necessary to build the campus areas as well as to construct the 54-mile tunnel.

Certain on-site activities are necessary in fiscal year 1991 and are reflected in the Committee's recommendation.

Construction activities include continued detailed design, the magnet industrialization program, procurement of technical systems components, on-site construction, and project management activities. The Committee recommends $168,866,000 for continuing these construction activities. In addition, significant construction of on-site facilities and other SSC systems is expected with funds contributed by the State of Texas.

The Committee also recommends $33,000,000 for capital equipment, including laboratory computing equipment, scientific instrumentation, laboratory support equipment, and detector prototype fabrication. Finally, the Committee recommends $116,000,000 in operating funds for continued R&D on accelerator systems and detectors.

The Committee has been impressed by the comprehensive high energy physics program at the University of Alabama. The University provides state-of-the-art research laboratory equipment in the science and engineering laboratories, an IBM3090 mainframe computer and access to the Alabama supercomputer. The Committee urges the Department of Energy and the Texas National Research Laboratory Commission to expand their SSC program at the University.

The Committee has been advised that the total funding required for the project is under review by the Department of Energy. Preliminary estimates indicate that the total cost of the project will increase by $1 billion to $2 billion. The Committee is very concerned about the continued viability of the project considering such massive cost increases. In addition, the Committee continues to be concerned with the Department's inability to show firm commitments with regard to foreign participation. There has been considerable discussion with regard to benefits of foreign participation, but to date there has been no commitment of funds. The Committee was advised last year that a commitment of SSC construction funding was required. Last year's appropriation of $217,732,000 has produced no results.

The construction of the Superconducting Super Collider is one of the most ambitious projects undertaken by our Nation. Traditionally, minority-owned firms have not been involved with projects of this magnitude. Consequently, our Nation faces a situation constituting de facto exclusion of qualified contracts from such projects. By setting aside at least 10 percent of the Federal funds to be used for the SSC, we help to enhance and guarantee minority involvement in the scientific and technological industries which are bound to shape our Nation's future.

The Committee expects the Department to make every effort to avoid duplication of work and expense with regard to the SSC project. An undertaking of this scope requires exacting management from within the agency to ensure that the various public and private entities are coordinated. The Committee also urges the Department to consider an advanced Geographic Information System as a means of achieving the desired coordination.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee recommendation for Nuclear Physics totals $330,729,000 which is the Administration's request and is an increase of $40,129,000 compared to FY 1990.

The Committee recommendation includes $65,000,000, the budget request, for continued construction of the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility (CEBAF). The Committee recommendation also includes $15,000,000 to initiate construction of the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current estimates and the budget request are shown in the following table:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH			
I. High energy physics			
A. Physics research			
Operating expenses	131,208	140,250	140,250
B. Facility operations			
Operating expenses	263,361	278,715	278,715
Capital equipment	80,063	83,730	83,730
Construction:			
91-G-304 AIP	---	18,535	18,535
90-R-101 AIP	13,838	---	---
90-R-104 Fermilab Linac Upgrade Project	4,634	8,000	8,000
GP-E-103 General plant projects, various locations	12,670	12,317	12,317
86-R-105 AGS Accumulator/Booster	4,915	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	36,057	38,852	38,852
Subtotal, Facility operations	379,481	401,297	401,297
C. High energy technology			
Operating expenses	71,722	75,190	75,190
D. Other capital equipment - CE	4,240	4,450	4,450
Subtotal, High energy physics	586,651	621,187	621,187
(Operating expenses)	(466,291)	(494,155)	(494,155)
(Capital equipment)	(84,303)	(88,180)	(88,180)
(Construction)	(36,057)	(38,852)	(38,852)
II. Nuclear physics			
A. Medium energy physics			
Operating expenses	92,388	101,000	101,000
B. Heavy ion physics			
Operating expenses	68,455	72,929	72,929
C. Low energy physics			
Operating expenses	26,326	28,100	28,100
D. Nuclear theory			
Operating expenses	12,226	13,500	13,500
E. Capital equipment	18,241	25,100	25,100

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
F. Construction:			
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider	---	15,000	15,000
91-G-301 AIP	---	4,300	4,300
90-R-AIP	4,536	---	---
GP-E-300 General plant projects, various locations	4,338	4,200	4,200
87-R-203 Continuous electron beam accelerator facility, Newport News, VA	62,611	65,000	65,000
Subtotal, Construction	71,485	88,500	88,500
G. Other capital equipment - CE	1,479	1,800	1,800
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	290,600	330,729	330,729
(Operating expenses)	(199,395)	(215,529)	(215,529)
(Capital equipment)	(19,720)	(26,700)	(26,700)
(Construction)	(71,485)	(88,500)	(88,500)
III. General Science program direction - OE	3,848	3,980	3,980
IV. Superconducting super collider			
Operating expenses	68,034	116,000	116,000
Capital equipment	20,706	33,000	33,000
Construction:			
90-R-106 Superconducting Super Collider	128,992	168,868	168,868
Subtotal, Superconducting super collider	217,732	317,868	317,868
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	1,098,829	1,273,732	1,273,732
(Operating expenses)	(737,566)	(829,634)	(829,634)
(Capital equipment)	(124,729)	(147,880)	(147,880)
(Construction)	(236,534)	(296,218)	(296,218)

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriation, 1990	$295,156,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	292,833,000
Recommended, 1991	292,833,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−2,323,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987 provide for the development, construction and operation of a repository for the disposal of high-level nuclear waste and spent fuel. It also establishes the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund to finance these activities through the collection of fees from the owners and generators of the waste. In FY 1991, the fund will generate revenues of $775,000,000 derived from fees and interest income.

The goal of the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund program is to obtain licenses for, construct, and operate a waste management system for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste from commercial and atomic energy defense activities in a manner that is safe and environmentally acceptable and in conformance with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) of 1982 and NWPA Amendments of 1987. Yucca Mountain, Nevada, has been designated as the site for detailed site characterization activities. The amended legislation also authorizes a Monitored Retrievable Storage (MRS) facility as an integral part of the overall waste management system and places certain conditions on its siting, construction, and operation.

The overall budget request for this activity is $292,833,000 including $10,000,000 for analysis of a Monitored Retrievable Storage site. The allowance provides the budget request.

The Committee notes with continuing concern that, despite the efforts of Congress to refocus the Department's efforts, the program has been plagued by the continuing schedule slips. The Department has continued to experience difficulties with the mandated characterization of the Yucca Mountain site. The Committee reiterates its belief that early and timely progress on this program is critical to the viability of the civilian nuclear power option. The program demands priority attention within the Department.

ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION FUND

Appropriation, 1990	$16,243,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	
Recommended, 1991	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−16,243,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

The Department, through the Isotope Production and Distribution program, provides radioactive and stable isotope products and associated services to a wide and varied domestic and international market. These materials and services are produced, processed and provided through the utilization of DOE facilities and scientific capabilities which exist to satisfy other DOE research and production missions. Ultimate applications of isotope products include medical research and health care, industrial research and manufacturing, agriculture, food preservation, education, and national defense. Prices for the products are established to recover program costs while revenues realized from the sales are retained by the program as an offset to costs and investments in processes, improvements, unique equipment, and isotope research.

The FY 1990 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, P.L. 101-101, authorized a separate Isotope Production and Distribution account with an initial capitalization of $16.2 million and the ability to retain revenues. The revenues are estimated to be $16.2 million in FY 1990.

In keeping with government policies and practices, prices are set for products offered under this program in a manner that will not discourage the use of the products nor the development of domestic sources of supply independent of DOE.

The appropriation language will allow retention of revenues received for use in funding isotope production, sale and distribution activities of the Department.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1990	$9,646,193,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	8,592,000,000
Recommended, 1991	10,915,148,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	1,268,955,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	2,323,148,000

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1990	$7,936,225,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	6,994,515,000
Recommended, 1991	8,921,330,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	985,105,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	1,926,815,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation, 1990	$1,709,968,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	1,597,485,000
Recommended, 1991	1,993,818,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	283,850,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	396,333,000

The appropriation recommended for Atomic Energy Defense Activities provides for the following programs: Weapons Activities; Nuclear Materials Production; Waste Transportation and Site Management; New Production Reactors; Naval Reactors Development; Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management; and Other National Security Programs.

As discussed earlier in this report, the Administration proposed combining defense and non-defense environmental restoration and waste management activities into a single appropriation account. The Committee rejected this proposal, and has included the defense-related cleanup activities under the Atomic Energy Defense appropriation. The recommended funding level for fiscal year 1991 reflects the increased funding associated with these environmental restoration activities.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

This program provides for the research, development, engineering, testing, and production of all U.S. nuclear weapons; maintenance of reliable weapons for their stockpile life; and retirement and disposal of nuclear weapons from the stockpile. Corollary activities include directing, planning, and coordinating research and development programs to advance weapons-related technologies which include nuclear directed energy weapons and inertial confinement fusion.

The fiscal year 1991 recommendation will continue efforts to maintain a modern nuclear force, along with the design and production of new weapons systems in response to defense requirements. The recommendation includes $175,000,000 for Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) and $191,904,000 for the Nuclear Directed Energy Weapons program.

The Committee recommendation for Weapons Activities totals $4,537,804,000 of which $3,835,381,000 is for operating expenses and $702,423,000 is for plant and capital equipment. This is an increase of $21,868,000 compared to fiscal year 1990 appropriations.

The Secretary of Energy has established a blue-ribbon panel to examine the operations and future mission of the DOE national laboratories. The Committee looks forward to working with the Secretary during this review process at the laboratories. Pending completion of this review, the Secretary is urged to examine the current construction activity at each of the laboratories to ensure that the proposed facilities are still necessary in view of the changing weapons requirements, current operational status of the DOE weapons complex, and projected missions for each of the sites. Accordingly, the Committee has provided only limited funds for fiscal year 1991 construction activities at the laboratories.

In light of the Administration's announced intention to cancel the Follow-on-to-Lance missile program and modernization of the 155mm AFAP, no funds for these programs are provided in the Committee's recommendation.

Weapons Activities are comprised of the following subcategories: Research and Development, Testing, Nuclear Directed Energy Weapons, Production and Surveillance, and Program Direction.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for Research and Development totals $1,164,261,000 which is less than the budget request and the fiscal year 1990 funding due to cancellation of two nuclear warhead programs and the transfer of Nuclear Directed Energy Weapons funding to a separate account.

Included in the Committee recommendation is $1,803,000 for a program of continued cooperative research in microelectronics engineering and imaging sciences at the Rochester Institute of Technology. These funds are included for research work that would be directly applicable to the Department's defense activities.

The Committee has included $1,150,000 in Project 87-D-104, Safeguards and Security Enhancement II, at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). The funding is to be provided to the City of Livermore for improvements to Vasco Road necessitated by safeguards and security improvements at LLNL which aggravated traffic conditions on this major street. The Department has proposed using operating funds for this offsite road improvement. The Committee does not support this approach and expects all offsite road improvements to be adequately identified and justified as construction funding requests.

It has come to the attention of the Committee that LLNL has proposed constructing several buildings partially on land purchased several years ago for a buffer zone between the City and LLNL for security purposes. The Congress provided $34 million for Project 83-D-199, Buffer Land Acquisition, over a period of several years. This program was to provide adequate buffer land for site protection at locations where suburban growth would result in inadequate isolation for developmental activities. The Committee has concluded that this is outside the original intent of the Congress in providing the buffer land. No additional construction should be initiated within lands originally purchased for the buffer zone.

Funding in prior years of approximately $75,000,000 has been provided to the Department for Project 88-D-105, Special Nuclear Materials R&D Laboratory Replacement, at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico. However, the FY 1991 budget indicates that the cost, schedule and scope of this project are currently under review. The scope of the project has significantly changed and the total estimated cost of the project has increased from $210,000,000 to an estimate in the range of $375,000,000. The Committee is concerned with the project's uncertainty which has suddenly appeared after three years of funding. In light of this, the Committee is providing no funds in FY 1991. The Committee will review the revised project scope, schedule and cost as part of the FY 1992 budget.

TESTING

The Committee recommendation for Testing activities totals $487,160,000, which is the same as the budget request, excluding Nuclear Directed Energy Weapons funding. Funds for Nuclear Directed Energy Weapons, $88,393,000 of which was requested in the Testing program, have been included in a separate account as described in the following section.

NUCLEAR DIRECTED ENERGY WEAPONS

The Committee recommendation for Nuclear Directed Energy Weapons is $191,904,000 which is the amount of the budget request, and a decrease of $24,796,000 from fiscal year 1990.

The budget structure presented by the Department provided funding for this activity in two separate program areas, R&D and Testing. The Committee recommendation consolidates the request into a single amount for nuclear directed energy weapons which should provide for increased efficiency in administering this program. Funding in the amount of $103,511,000 was transferred from the R&D program and $88,393,000 from the Testing program.

INERTIAL CONFINEMENT FUSION

The Committee recommendation for Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) is $175,000,000 which includes a recommendation of $157,900,000 for operating expenses and $17,100,000 for capital equipment, an increase of $8,200,000 over the budget request. Within available funds, $16,100,000 is provided to upgrade the OMEGA laser at the University of Rochester.

The Committee has reviewed the National Academy of Science's interim report of the Department of Energy's Inertial Confinement Fusion program which notes that the ICF program on the whole is " . . . a well-managed and well-executed effort that attracts extremely able scientists and engineers to a clear and important national objective." The NAS final report, due September 1990, is not expected to contain major changes. The Committee expects the Department to implement the program consistent with the priorities and recommendations included in the NAS report on the ICF program.

PRODUCTION AND SURVEILLANCE

The Committee recommendation for Production and Surveillance totals $2,588,054,000 which is less than the budget request, but an increase of $78,891,000 compared to fiscal year 1990. The recommendation reflects the cancellation of the Follow-on-to-Lance missile program and the modernization of the 155mm AFAP.

Full funding has been provided for Project 89–D–125, Plutonium Recovery Modification Project, at the Rocky Flats Plant. Despite the Committee's serious concern that the total estimated cost of the project has increased significantly, the fundamental need for safe, reliable processing of plutonium residues and retired weapon parts remains. The Secretary of Energy is urged to complete the testing and validation of the proposed technology and processes on a full-scale demonstration basis prior to obligating line-item construction funds. The Committee expects the Department to take every action possible to avoid the failures exhibited in the management and construction of the original Building 371 project.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

Program direction is funded at $106,425,000, which is the budget request.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current year estimates and the budget request are shown in the following table:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
I. Research and development			
A. Research and development - weapons			
Operating expenses	790,728	813,664	793,664
Capital equipment	92,467	91,300	91,300
Construction:			
GP-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	20,419	20,000	20,000
90-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, & testing facilities revitalization, Phase III, various locations	985	19,600	9,600
88-D-105 Special nuclear materials R & D laboratory replacement, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	43,340	20,600	---
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development, & testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, various locations	74,269	72,547	72,547
Subtotal, Construction	139,013	132,747	102,147
Subtotal, Research and development - weapons	1,022,208	1,037,711	987,111
B. Nuclear directed energy weapons			
Operating expenses	95,545	91,211	---
Capital equipment	5,910	7,300	---
Construction:			
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, (NDER facility at LLNL)	18,715	5,000	---
Subtotal, Nuclear directed energy weapons	120,170	103,511	---
C. Inertial fusion			
Operating expenses	162,722	157,900	157,900
Capital equipment	8,609	8,900	17,100
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	171,331	166,800	175,000
D. Environment, safety and health			
Construction:			
90-D-103 ES&H improvements, various locations	10,540	---	---
88-D-102 Sanitary wastewater systems consolidation, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	3,054	---	---
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,122	---	---
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	18,716	---	---
E. Safeguards and security			
Construction:			
88-D-104 Safeguards and security upgrade, Phase II, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	985	1,000	1,000
87-D-104 Safeguards and security enhancement II, LLNL, Livermore, CA	6,895	---	1,150
Subtotal, Safeguards and security	7,880	1,000	2,150
Subtotal, Research and development	1,340,305	1,309,022	1,164,261

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
II. Testing			
A. Weapons program			
Operating expenses	415,374	442,268	442,268
Capital equipment	39,814	33,550	33,550
Construction:			
GP-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	7,289	7,100	7,100
Subtotal, Weapons program	462,477	482,918	482,918
B. Nuclear directed energy weapons			
Operating expenses	88,650	84,443	---
Capital equipment	7,880	3,950	---
Subtotal, Nuclear directed energy weapons	96,530	88,393	---
C. Safeguards and security			
Construction:			
85-D-105 Combined device assembly facility, Nevada Test Site, NV	9,318	4,242	4,242
Subtotal, Testing	568,325	575,553	487,160
Subtotal, Research, development and testing	1,908,630	1,884,575	1,651,421
(Operating expenses)	(1,553,019)	(1,589,486)	(1,393,832)
(Capital equipment)	(154,680)	(145,000)	(141,950)
(Construction)	(200,931)	(150,089)	(115,639)
III. Nuclear directed energy weapons			
Operating expenses	---	---	175,654
Capital equipment	---	---	11,250
Construction:			
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II (NDER facility at LLNL)	---	---	5,000
Subtotal, Nuclear directed energy weapons	---	---	191,904
IV. Production and surveillance			
Operating expenses	2,068,500	2,299,880	2,161,180
Capital equipment	123,716	128,571	128,571
Construction:			
Decision costs:			
91-D-122 Short range attack missile tactical (SRAM-T) production facilities	---	15,000	15,000
90-D-122 Production capabilities from the nuclear depth/strike bomb (ND/SB), various locations	7,880	13,700	13,700
90-D-123 Follow on to lance warhead production facilities, various locations	---	3,500	---
87-D-122 Short-range attack missile II (SRAM II) warhead production facilities, various locations	40,582	8,634	8,634
Subtotal, Decision costs	48,462	40,834	37,334
Production base:			
Facilities capability assurance program:			
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	81,853	131,806	106,806

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
Production support facilities:			
GP-D-121 General plant projects, various locations	30,387	36,350	36,350
91-D-123 Production assurance transformer replacement, Kansas City Plant	---	2,600	2,600
90-D-124 High explosives (HE) synthesis facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	1,773	---	---
89-D-122 Production waste storage facility Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	9,062	---	---
89-D-125 Plutonium recovery modification project (Bldg. 371), Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	44,325	65,000	65,000
88-D-125 High explosive machining facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	35,460	8,840	8,840
86-D-130 Tritium loading facility replacement, Savannah River Plant, Aiken, SC	23,665	2,360	2,360
Subtotal, Production support facilities	144,672	115,150	115,150
Subtotal, Production base - construction	226,525	246,956	221,956
Environment, safety and health:			
91-D-126 Health physics calibration facility (HPCF), Mound, Miamisburg, OH	---	1,000	1,000
91-D-127 Criticality alarm and production annunciation utility replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	---	6,600	6,600
91-D-128 Environment, safety and health, Phase III, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	---	1,746	---
90-D-125 Steam plant ash disposal facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	1,477	---	---
90-D-126 Environment, safety and health improvements, various locations	26,300	8,500	8,500
89-D-126 Environment, safety and health upgrade, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	3,447	488	488
88-D-124 Fire protection upgrading, various locations	5,319	1,481	1,481
88-D-126 Personnel radiological monitoring laboratories, various locations	---	1,600	1,600
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	36,543	21,415	19,669

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
Safeguards and security:			
91-D-124 Safeguards and security upgrades, phase III, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH....	---	1,100	1,100
88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	5,417	18,244	18,244
Subtotal, Safeguards and security..............	5,417	19,344	19,344
Subtotal, Construction..............................	316,947	328,649	298,303
Subtotal, Production and surveillance.................	2,509,163	2,757,000	2,588,084
V. Program direction			
Operating expenses			
1. Weapons program	87,520	95,514	95,514
2. Community assistance	8,914	9,201	9,201
Subtotal, Operating expenses........................	96,434	104,715	104,715
Capital equipment	1,709	1,710	1,710
Subtotal, Program direction...........................	98,143	106,425	106,425
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES.............................	4,515,936	4,748,000	4,537,804
(Operating expenses)...................................	(3,717,953)	(3,994,081)	(3,835,381)
(Capital equipment)...................................	(280,105)	(275,281)	(283,481)
(Construction)..	(517,878)	(478,638)	(418,942)

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The Materials Production program provides nuclear materials to meet near-term national defense and non-defense requirements. In addition, Materials Production sustains a base production program capable of meeting long-term nuclear materials production requirements consistent with the annual Presidential Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum.

The Materials Production program operates a complex of feed materials and fuel fabrication facilities, production reactors and processing plants at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina; the Hanford site in Richland, Washington; the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory in Idaho Falls, Idaho; and various other sites. These facilities are unique to the production of nuclear materials for defense purposes.

The Committee recommendation for Materials Production totals $2,341,999,000, of which $1,892,869,000 is for operating expenses and $449,130,000 is for plant and capital equipment. This reflects an increase of $80,806,000 from fiscal year 1990.

The Materials Production program is organized into the following subcategories: Reactor Operations, Processing of Nuclear Materials, Supporting Services, Enriched Material, Capital Equipment, and Program Direction.

REACTOR OPERATIONS

The Committee recommendation for Reactor Operations is $865,338,000 which is $2,000,000 less than the budget request, but an increase of $90,351,000 compared to fiscal year 1990. The significant increase over the prior year is due to activities needed to restart the Savannah River reactors.

PROCESSING OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS

The Committee recommendation for Processing of Nuclear Materials totals $637,469,000, an increase of $13,070,000 over fiscal year 1990, and the same as the budget request.

SUPPORTING SERVICES

The Committee recommendation for Supporting Services totals $573,170,000 which is $10,000,000 less than the budget request due to fiscal constraints, but an increase of $15,324,000 over the previous year.

ENRICHED MATERIAL

The Committee recommendation for Enriched Material is $117,900,000 which is $59,001,000 less than the budget request. Requirements for enriched uranium have changed since the Department's budget was submitted. The recommended funding level will fully support FY 1991 requirements.

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT AND PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation is $105,622,000 for Capital Equipment which is the budget request. The Committee recommendation for Program Direction is $42,500,000, also the same as the budget request.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current year estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
MATERIALS PRODUCTION			
I. Reactor operations			
Operating expenses	704,378	811,457	811,457
Construction:			
Environment, safety and health:			
91-D-148 Reactor charge/discharge training simulator, Savannah River Site, SC	---	2,000	---
90-D-142 Coal storage facility environmental upgrade, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	906	---	---
90-D-150 Reactor safety assurance, Savannah River, SC	12,509	32,600	32,600
89-D-141 M-Area waste disposal, Savannah River, SC	7,683	---	---
89-D-142 Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River, SC	39,400	---	---
89-D-148 Improved reactor confinement system, Savannah River, SC	6,994	12,800	12,800
86-D-152 Reactor electrical distribution system, Savannah River, SC	3,117	---	---
85-D-145 Fuel prod. fac., Savannah River, SC	---	8,481	8,481
Subtotal, Construction	70,609	55,881	53,881
Subtotal, Reactor operations	774,987	867,338	865,338
II. Processing of nuclear materials			
Operating expenses	580,764	628,969	628,969
Construction:			
Programmatic projects:			
86-D-148 Special isotope separation project, Idaho Falls, ID	39,400	---	---
Environment, safety and health:			
90-D-141 Idaho chemical processing plant fire protection, Idaho Falls, ID	3,447	6,000	6,000
90-D-143 Plutonium finishing plant fire safety and loss limitation, Richland, WA	788	2,500	2,500
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	4,235	8,500	8,500
Subtotal, Construction	43,635	8,500	8,500
Subtotal, Processing of nuclear materials	624,399	637,469	637,469
III. Supporting services			
Operating expenses	278,626	302,043	292,043
Construction:			
Programmatic projects:			
91-D-143 Increase 751-A elec substation capacity, Savannah River Site, SC	---	6,000	6,000
GP-D-146 General plant projects, various locations	36,250	36,994	36,994
90-D-151 Engineering Ctr, Savannah River, SC.	6,895	4,000	4,000
86-D-149 Productivity retention program, Phases I thru VI, various locations	80,553	61,750	61,750
85-D-139 Fuel processing restoration, Idaho Fuel Processing Facility, INEL, ID	73,875	87,500	87,500
Subtotal, Programmatic projects	197,573	196,244	196,244
Environment, safety and health:			
91-D-145 New whole body counter facility, Savannah River Site, SC	---	4,350	4,350
90-D-149 Plantwide fire protection, Phases I and II, Savannah River, SC	4,826	49,100	49,100
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	54,284	14,133	14,133
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	59,110	67,583	67,583

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
Safeguards and security:			
89-D-140 Additional separations safeguards, Savannah River, SC	10,146	16,300	16,300
88-D-153 Additional reactor safeguards, Savannah River, SC	6,304	1,000	1,000
86-D-166 Plantwide safeguards systems, Savannah River, SC	6,088	---	---
Subtotal, Safeguards and security	22,538	17,300	17,300
Subtotal, Construction	279,221	281,127	281,127
Subtotal, Supporting services	557,846	583,170	573,170
IV. Enriched material	166,366	176,901	117,900
V. Capital equipment	102,859	105,622	105,622
VI. Program direction	34,736	42,500	42,500
TOTAL, MATERIALS PRODUCTION	2,261,193	2,413,000	2,341,999
(Operating expenses)	(1,764,869)	(1,961,870)	(1,892,869)
(Capital equipment)	(102,859)	(105,622)	(105,622)
(Construction)	(393,465)	(345,508)	(343,508)

WASTE TRANSPORTATION AND SITE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Transportation and Site Management program includes the Department-wide transportation management activities to assure the safe, secure and economical transportation of DOE materials including radioactive and other hazardous materials and waste. This program also funds the landlord responsibilities at the Idaho and Richland Operations Office sites where funds are used for maintenance, procurement and construction of common use equipment, facilities, utilities and roadways.

The Committee recommendation is $85,130,000 which is $870,000 less than the budget request of $86,000,000. Budget constraints have limited the number of new construction starts funded in fiscal year 1991.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current year estimates, and the budget request are shown in the following table:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
WASTE TRANSPORTATION AND SITE MANAGEMENT			
I. Transportation management			
Operating expenses	---	14,660	14,660
Capital equipment	---	531	531
Subtotal, Transportation management	---	15,191	15,191
II. Program direction/landlord			
Operating expenses	---	21,386	21,386
Capital equipment	---	18,567	18,567
Construction:			
GP-D-171 General plant projects	---	13,556	13,556
91-D-170 INEL transportation complex, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	---	870	---
91-D-175 300 area electrical distribution conversion and safety improvements, phase I Richland, WA	---	900	900
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance-I, Richland, WA	---	8,230	8,230
89-D-171 INEL road renovation, ID	---	7,300	7,300
Subtotal, Construction	---	30,856	29,986
TOTAL, WASTE TRANSPORTATION AND SITE MANAGEMENT	---	86,000	85,130
(Operating expenses)	---	(36,046)	(36,046)
(Capital equipment)	---	(19,098)	(19,098)
(Construction)	---	(30,856)	(29,986)

NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS

The New Production Reactors program provides for the acquisition, including design and construction, of new production reactor capability to meet national security requirements. Activities include planning, development, and execution of program strategy and management and application of standards for safety, quality, environmental and performance factors into the design and construction of new production reactor capability.

The Committee's recommendation includes $363,000,000, the budget request, for the continued acquisition, design, and construction of new production reactors to meet national security requirements.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current year estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS			
1. New production reactors			
Operating expenses	200,448	132,900	132,900
Capital equipment	---	8,800	8,800
Construction:			
88-D-154 New production reactor capacity, various locations (design only)	98,500	221,300	221,300
TOTAL, NEW PRODUCTION REACTORS	298,948	363,000	363,000
(Operating expenses)	(200,448)	(132,900)	(132,900)
(Capital equipment)	---	(8,800)	(8,800)
(Construction)	(98,500)	(221,300)	(221,300)

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

The Naval Reactors Development program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores having long fuel life, high reliability, improved performances, and simplified operating and maintenance requirements. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships.

The Committee recommendation includes $652,000,000 for the Naval Reactors Development program which is the budget request.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current year estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT			
I. Naval reactors development			
A. Plant development			
Operating expenses	85,695	89,300	89,300
B. Reactor development			
Operating expenses	241,621	258,900	258,900
C. Reactor operation and evaluation			
Operating expenses	213,745	207,000	207,000
D. Capital equipment	53,190	55,400	55,400
E. Construction			
GP-N-101 General plant projects, various locations	8,373	8,600	8,600
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	3,546	4,000	4,000
90-N-103 Advanced test reactor off-gas treatment system, INEL, ID	197	1,800	1,800
90-N-104 Facility renovations, Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory (KAPL), Niskayuna, NY	3,842	7,900	7,900
89-N-102 Heat transfer test facility, KAPL, Niskayuna, NY	6,403	3,600	3,600
89-N-103 Advanced test reactor modifications, Test Reactor Area, INEL, ID	3,064	---	---
89-N-104 Power system upgrade, Naval Reactors Facility, Idaho Falls, ID	6,304	---	---
88-N-102 Expended core facility receiving station, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	2,955	1,500	1,500
Subtotal, Construction	34,674	27,400	27,400
F. Program direction	13,298	14,000	14,000
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT	642,223	652,000	652,000
(Operating expenses)	(554,359)	(569,200)	(569,200)
(Capital equipment)	(53,190)	(55,400)	(55,400)
(Construction)	(34,674)	(27,400)	(27,400)

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT (DEFENSE)

The Administration proposed in the FY 1991 budget submission a new, single appropriation account for Environmental Restoration and Waste Management. This would have consolidated all defense and non-defense environmental cleanup activities that have historically been included in several appropriation accounts. The Committee's recommendation has maintained the separation of defense and non-defense funds for cleanup activities.

This program encompasses four categories of activities: Corrective Activities are activities necessary to bring DOE facilities into compliance with applicable local, state and Federal regulations; Waste Management includes the treatment, storage, and disposal of radioactive, hazardous, mixed or sanitary wastes generated as a result of ongoing operations at active facilities; Environmental Restoration includes the assessment and cleanup of surplus facilities and inactive sites; and Technology Development is an applied research and development initiative to support environmental restoration and waste management activities.

The Committee has recommended $2,714,807,000 for environmental cleanup activities at the Department's defense facilities. The recommendation increases funding by $353,056,000 over the budget request. This funding should enable the development of new techniques for elimination of problems associated with cleanup activities, and ultimately, lower the overall cost of the program. This is a substantial increase over the FY 1990 program of cleanup of defense sites and facilities. In FY 1990, $1,634,082,000 was provided for the Defense Waste and Environmental Restoration program.

General.—The Committee is aware that the Department has entered into agreements with various states outlining required cleanup activities. To the extent that these funds were included in the budget request and funds were appropriated, the Department should ensure that funds are provided to honor such agreements.

It is the Committee's intent that the Department should ensure that funds are used only for waste cleanup purposes identified in the budget or as directed by Congress in the appropriation reports.

Corps of Engineers Services.—The Secretary of Energy is directed to use the engineering services of the Secretary of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Walla Walla District, to manage and carry out the environmental remediation activities and restoration of the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington, using funds appropriated to the Department of Energy.

The task of identifying and either permanently and safely isolating or cleaning up the hazardous, toxic, and radioactive waste contamination at Department of Energy (DOE) sites throughout the country is one of the major environmental and engineering challenges facing our Nation today. At stake are not only public health and safety and environmental quality, but also our national defense and the public trust in its Government's willingness and ability to protect its citizens. Current estimates of the total cleanup costs for the DOE sites range from $60 billion to $200 billion over the next 20 to 50 years. The size and complexity of this challenge require the Nation's best public and private engineering resources.

The Committee recognizes that the Administration has assigned national priority to the mission of correcting environmental problems at DOE's nuclear facilities. The Committee further recognizes that DOE, through its Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Five-Year Plan, has recently begun to develop a long-term strategy for dealing with the environmental problems resulting from its operations over the last forty years. The Committee wants to ensure, however, that all of the Government's available resources are brought to bear on this problem.

As indicated above, the task of cleaning up the DOE sites is primarily an engineering and environmental challenge. And, while the private sector will have an important role in the cleanup of the DOE sites, there is also a valuable source of construction management expertise within the Federal Government—the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps is experienced at evaluating and addressing the controversial and sensitive environmental problems associated with such projects. Moreover, the Corps' expertise in managing the Defense Environmental Restoration Program for the Department of Defense and executing a large portion of the Superfund program for the Environmental Protection Agency, both of which involve the cleanup of hazardous and toxic waste sites, is directly applicable to the cleanup of the DOE sites. Further, the Corps' hydrologic and water resources experience will be invaluable with respect to those aspects of the cleanup effort which involve navigable waters.

The Committee is convinced that the environmental problems at the DOE site are critical. The Committee is further convinced that the Corps of Engineers has valuable technical expertise, the necessary management capability, and a proven track record in managing complex projects. Use of the Corps would take advantage of this resource while also providing Federal technical oversight over the program.

Accordingly, after careful consideration, the Committee has determined that, in light of the recent priority placed on cleanup of its sites and the progress in developing a management plan, DOE should remain responsible for the overall cleanup program. However, the Committee has decided that DOE should use the services of the Corps for the cleanup of the Hanford Site. The Committee directs DOE to assign the Corps full management responsibilities, rather than individual tasks. Consistent with its program/project management approach, the Corps is directed to use the private sector to the maximum extent feasible in executing the environmental remediation activities and restoration of the Hanford Site. During the oversight process, the Committee will be evaluating whether the Army's responsibility should be expanded to include the cleanup of the remaining DOE sites.

Fernald Litigation.—Within available funds, $20,500,000 is provided to make the second payment for the settlement arrived at with the Department in the *In Re Fernald* class action litigation. This requirement arose out of a litigation settlement involving environmental mishaps which occurred at the Feed Materials Production Center in Fernald, Ohio.

Groundwater Monitoring.—In cooperation with the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Energy shall construct a groundwater monitoring network in the vicinity of the Savannah River Site, but within the boundaries of the State of Georgia. Establishment of such a groundwater monitoring network, including 10 years of monitoring, shall not exceed $300,000. The monitoring will be conducted by the State of Georgia.

Report Requirement.—The Department should submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report detailing how the fiscal year 1990 Environmental Restoration and Waste Management funds for defense and non-defense activities have been expended and the accomplishments to date compared to the milestone for each task. The report should be prepared at the following level of detail: operations office, installation, budget category, and task. The information provided should include a description of the tasks performed at each site as well as obligation and cost data, and be submitted to the Congress at the same time as the fiscal year 1992 President's budget. The report should also include any proposed schedule changes or modifications to tasks which were approved and funded for FY 1991.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current year estimates, and the budget request are shown in the following table:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT (DEFENSE)			
I. Corrective activities			
A. Environmental management			
Operating expenses	---	---	23,346
Capital equipment	---	---	1,980
Construction:			
GP-D-171 General Plant Project	---	---	3,720
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance	---	---	6,800
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	---	---	22,601
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	33,121
Subtotal, Environmental management	---	---	58,447
B. Defense programs			
Operating expenses	---	---	17,808
Construction:			
GP-D-171 General plant projects	---	---	5,259
90-D-103 Environment, safety and health improvements, various locations	---	---	4,200
90-D-125 Steam plant ash disposal facility, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	---	6,000
89-D-126 Environmental, safety, & health upgrade, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	---	---	1,723
89-D-142 Reactor effluent cooling water thermal mitigation, Savannah River, SC	---	---	28,000
88-D-102 Sanitary wastewaters systems consolidated, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	---	---	3,600
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	48,682
Subtotal, Defense programs	---	---	66,490
Subtotal, Corrective activities	---	---	124,937
(Operating expenses)	---	---	(43,134)
(Capital equipment)	---	---	---
(Construction)	---	---	(81,803)
II. Environmental restoration			
Operating expenses:			
1. Facilities and sites	---	---	986,271

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
III. Waste management			
Operating expenses:			
1. Waste operations	---	---	1,137,927
Capital equipment	---	---	82,019
Construction:			
GP-D-171 General plant projects	---	---	41,154
91-D-125 Environment, safety and health upgrades, Phase III, Mound Facility Miamisburg, OH	---	---	---
91-D-173 Hazardous low-level waste processing tanks, Savannah River Site, SC	---	---	5,800
91-D-172 High-level waste tank farm upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing plant, INEL, ID	---	---	13,000
91-D-171 Waste receiving and processing facility, module 1, Richland, WA	---	---	2,700
90-D-171 Laboratory ventilation and electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA	---	---	4,100
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA	---	---	4,000
90-D-173 B-plant canyon crane replacement, Richland, WA	---	---	4,300
90-D-174 Decontamination laundry facility, Richland, WA	---	---	9,900
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance-I, Richland, WA	---	---	2,640
90-D-176 Transuranic (TRU) waste facility, Savannah River, SC	---	---	15,300
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste treatment and storage facility, ID	---	---	26,000
90-D-178 TSA retrieval containment building, ID	---	---	11,100
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance, Richland, WA	---	---	35,660
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	---	---	3,400
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	---	---	11,330
89-D-175 Hazardous waste/mixed waste disposal facility, Savannah River, SC	---	---	7,600
89-D-122 Production waste storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	---	5,500
89-D-141 M-Area waste disposal, Savannah River, SC	---	---	7,500
88-D-173 Hanford waste vitrification plant (HWVP), Richland, WA	---	---	75,500
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Phases I, II, III, & IV, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, OH	---	---	4,985
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	---	---	5,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	---	296,469
Subtotal, Waste management	---	---	1,516,415
(Operating expenses)	---	---	(1,137,927)
(Capital equipment)	---	---	(82,019)
(Construction)	---	---	(296,469)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
IV. Technology development			
Operating expenses	---	---	183,480
Capital equipment	---	---	16,820
Subtotal, Technology development	---	---	200,300
Subtotal, Environ restor and waste mgmt (defense)	---	---	2,827,923
Program slippage due to delays in permitting	---	---	-113,116
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTOR AND WASTE MGMT (DEFENSE)	(1,634,082)	---	2,714,807
(Operating expenses)	---	---	(2,254,516)
(Capital equipment)	---	---	(82,019)
(Construction)	---	---	(378,272)

OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Included in this category are these principal subprograms:

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

This program supports the development and execution of U.S. national security and foreign policy in the areas of treaty verification, intelligence, and arms control. The FY 1991 program provides for development of verification technologies for special nuclear materials, a START treaty, and increased analytical support activities.

The Committee recommendation is $164,408,000 which is $9,592,000 less than the budget request. Due to budget constraints, no funds have been provided to initiate construction of Project 91-D-192, Foreign Technology Assessment Center, at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. Funding for Project 90-D-186, Center for National Security and Arms Control, at Sandia National Laboratory has been reduced pending a review of the future missions of the national laboratories.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

This program includes activities to assure adequate protection of nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, facilities, and classified information against theft, sabotage, espionage, and terrorist activities. The program also focuses on providing safeguards technical support to United States and international activities designed to minimize the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Committee's recommendation for this activity is $91,000,000, the same as the budget request.

The Committee notes that the Department of Energy has expended or plans to expend through FY 1991 at least $764,000 to develop an interactive laser video system for use in firearms training for security inspectors. The program has exceeded initial cost estimates, is far behind the initial planning schedule, and has been the subject of an investigation by the Inspector General of the Department of Energy. It also appears that DOE did not properly evaluate commercially available firearms training systems before proceeding with development of its own system.

Because of the increasing cost of this program, the findings of the Inspector General, and because interactive video systems are now commercially produced for law enforcement and the military to meet needs similar to those of DOE, the Committee expects DOE to procure any additional interactive firearms simulators required for training through the commercial bid process in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations for those systems required for FY 1991 and beyond. No systems should be obtained outside the commercial bid process unless the Secretary certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that such action is necessary to meet national security needs, and provides the Committees with a detailed justification and cost projection of such action.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

This program includes those activities necessary for granting appropriate security clearances to agency and Government contractor personnel who must, in the performance of their work, have access to restricted data, national security information, or special nuclear material, or who occupy a designated critical sensitive position.

The Committee recommendation is equal to the budget request of $65,000,000.

DISCRETIONARY R&D REDUCTION

As noted earlier in this report, the Committee has expressed concern about the Department's general policy of allowing laboratory-directed research and development. This R&D is funded by taxing all programs conducted at the laboratories. Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee has recommended a reduction of $100,000,000.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current year estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS			
I. Verification and control technology			
Operating expenses	156,759	151,484	151,484
Capital equipment	9,586	9,924	9,924
Construction:			
91-D-192 Foreign Technology Assessment Center, LLNL, Livermore, CA	---	2,592	---
90-D-186 Center for national security and arms control, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	985	10,000	3,000
Subtotal, Construction	985	12,592	3,000
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	167,330	174,000	164,408
(Operating expenses)	(156,759)	(151,484)	(151,484)
(Capital equipment)	(9,586)	(9,924)	(9,924)
(Construction)	(985)	(12,592)	(3,000)
II. Nuclear safeguards and security			
Operating expenses	81,007	83,934	83,934
Capital equipment	4,892	5,066	5,066
Construction:			
GP-D-186 General plant projects	---	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Nuclear safeguards and security	85,899	91,000	91,000
(Operating expenses)	(81,007)	(83,934)	(83,934)
(Capital equipment)	(4,892)	(5,066)	(5,066)
(Construction)	---	(2,000)	(2,000)
III. Security investigations - OE	40,582	65,000	65,000
TOTAL, OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS	293,811	330,000	320,408
(Operating expenses)	(278,348)	(300,418)	(300,418)
(Capital equipment)	(14,478)	(14,990)	(14,990)
(Construction)	(985)	(14,592)	(5,000)
Independent R & D reduction	---	---	-100,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	9,646,193	8,592,000	10,915,148
(Operating expenses)	(7,936,225)	(6,994,515)	(8,921,330)
(Capital equipment)	(500,006)	(479,191)	(569,410)
(Construction)	(1,209,962)	(1,118,294)	(1,424,408)

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1990	$350,085,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	407,840,000
Recommended, 1991	375,095,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+25,010,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	−32,745,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 1990	−147,900,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	−183,413,000
Recommended, 1991	−150,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−2,100,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+33,413,000

The appropriations recommended for Departmental Administration provide for the Office of the Secretary and the Department's general management, administrative and program support functions not directly associated with program execution. The account provides for (1) development and analysis of alternative energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of DOE programs; (2) the salaries, travel and other costs associated with the management and support of DOE; (3) the institutional relations program that provides information services and other activities focusing on the industrial, academic, and public communities, and support for energy training and education; (4) development of international energy policy and international cooperation in energy matters; and (5) revenues from the sale of DOE products and services and their related costs.

The Committee recommendation provides the funding requested by the Department with the exception that the Committee recommends $3,500,000 for the Office of Minority Economic Impact. This funding will continue the program at the FY 1990 appropriation level.

The Committee recognizes that funds received by the Department from its reimbursable activities may be used to fund general purpose capital equipment which is used in support of those activities.

REVENUES

The Department's past forecasts of revenues have been overstated, accordingly, the revenues have been reduced to $150,000,000 and cost of work for others and the operating programs have been reduced by a corresponding $33,413,000.

The Committee recognizes that the Department performs work for other Federal agencies. The Department had requested funds for capital equipment in the cost of work program to replace general purpose equipment consumed in performing work for other Federal agencies. The Committee believes that the Department should continue to obtain funds for general purpose equipment needed to perform work for others from the customer agency under a reimbursable arrangement.

GENERAL REDUCTION

The Department is directed to apply a general reduction of $9,000,000 in such a manner as to minimize any adverse impact on the activities of the Department.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendations, current estimates and the budget request are shown in the following tables:

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
I. Administrative operations			
A. Office of the Secretary - salaries and expenses.	2,073	3,911	3,911
B. General management - personnel compensation and benefits	152,126	153,227	153,227
C. General management - other expenses			
1. Travel	5,923	5,314	5,314
2. Services	129,618	132,137	132,137
3. Capital equipment	3,231	4,942	4,942
Subtotal, Other expenses	138,772	142,393	142,393
D. Program support			
1. Policy analysis and system studies	2,587	4,300	4,300
3. Consumer affairs	64	45	45
4. Public affairs	266	42	42
5. Competition	49	---	---
6. International policy studies	967	1,359	1,359
7. Office of minority economic impact	3,455	2,832	3,500
Subtotal, Program support	7,388	8,578	9,246
Subtotal, Administrative operations	300,359	308,109	308,777
II. Cost of work for others	82,825	116,131	91,718
III. Miscellaneous revenues	-147,900	-183,413	-150,000
Subtotal, Departmental administration	235,284	240,827	250,495
Use of unobligated balances	-33,099	-16,400	-16,400
General reduction	---	---	-9,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	202,185	224,427	225,095
(Operating expenses)	(198,954)	(219,485)	(220,153)
(Capital equipment)	(3,231)	(4,942)	(4,942)

Office of Inspector General

Appropriation, 1990	$22,638,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	28,421,000
Recommended, 1991	28,421,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+5,783,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

As required by the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, the Office of Inspector General is funded as a separate appropriation.

This appropriation provides agencywide audit and investigative functions to identify and correct management and administrative deficiencies which create conditions for existing or potential instances of fraud, waste and mismanagement. The audits function provides internal audit, contract audit, and inspections services.

Power Marketing Activities

Public Law 95-91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Alaska Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

All power marketing administrations except Bonneville are funded annually with appropriations and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury. Bonneville Power operations are self-financing under authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-454). The Act authorizes Bonneville Power to use its revenues to finance operating costs, maintenance and capital construction, and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining capital program requirements.

PRIVATIZATION OF POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

The Administration is pursuing legislation to study the sale of the assets of the Southeastern Power Administration. The FY 1986 Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 99-349) contains a legislative prohibition that would suspend action on studying the sale of the Power Marketing Administrations (PMAs) and Tennessee Valley Authority until Congress has reviewed the proposal. The Committee reiterates its support of the provision contained in the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act.

The Committee supports efforts to sell the Alaska Power Administration. However, the Committee remains opposed to the sale of the other PMAs and the Administration has been unable to state how the sale of the PMAs would be in the public interest. The Committee has received testimony from the Administration that the PMAs would not be sold without the enactment of enabling legislation.

RATE AND REPAYMENT REFORM

The Administration is proposing rate and repayment reforms in FY 1991 that would cause significant increases in the rates charged by the Power Marketing Administrations. The Committee has historically been a strong supporter of fiscal responsibility by the PMAs. However, this type of rate reform would have significant adverse impact on the economic health of the regions supported by the PMAs and might result in less repayments to the Federal Government because of the loss of significant energy-intensive industries in the regions. Further, if rate reform were adopted in the near future, it is extremely doubtful that any impact on receipts to the Treasury would occur in FY 1991 as assumed in the budget reflecting only a gimmick to appear to achieve deficit targets. Accordingly, the Committee has again included bill language preventing a change from a cost base to market base for PMA rates. This language is intended to prevent a unilateral change in the terms of agreements that were made years ago between the Federal Government and the regions served by the PMAs.

The Committee has been assured that the Administration will make no changes in the rate development process administratively. The Committee, therefore, directs that the rate structure not be modified without enactment of appropriate legislation.

($ in thousands)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
I. Operation and maintenance			
A. Power marketing			
1. Operating expenses	3,134	3,233	3,233
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
I. Operation and maintenance			
A. Power marketing			
1. Operating expenses	2,324	2,624	2,624
2. Purchase power and wheeling	16,132	17,661	17,661
3. Use of prior year balances	---	-11,000	-11,000
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	18,456	9,285	9,285
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
I. Operation and maintenance			
A. Power marketing			
1. Operating expenses	17,201	17,316	17,316
2. Purchase power and wheeling	7,020	7,899	7,899
3. Construction	9,236	10,182	10,182
4. Use of prior year balances	-8,400	-15,290	-15,290
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	25,057	20,107	20,107
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
I. Operation and maintenance			
A. Power marketing			
1. Construction and rehabilitation	93,517	110,820	110,820
2. System operation and maintenance	98,514	115,609	115,609
3. Purchase power and wheeling	98,623	95,298	95,298
4. Unobligated balances	---	-27,565	-27,565
5. Transfer of permanent authority from DOI	(3,564)	(4,702)	(4,702)
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	290,654	293,762	293,762

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1990	$3,134,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	3,233,000
Recommended, 1991	3,233,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+99,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

The Alaska Power Administration is responsible for operation, maintenance, and power marketing of two Federal hydroelectric projects in Alaska. The operating projects are the 30 MW Eklutna Project near Anchorage and the 78 MW Snettisham Project near Juneau. Project facilities include dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission systems and necessary maintenance facilities. Power is marketed at wholesale to four Alaskan utilities. The projects represent a current Federal investment of $174 million and a replacement value in excess of $336 million.

The Administration's FY 1991 budget again assumes that the Alaska Power Administration programs and facilities will be divested; however, the budget assumes that they will not be divested before the end of FY 1991. The transfer, which will require authorizing legislation, is continuing to be pursued and negotiations appear promising.

The Committee continues to support the transfer and recommends funding the Alaska Power Administration in FY 1991 at the requested level.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

Appropriation, 1990	
Budget Estimate, 1991	
Recommended, 1991	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	
Budget Estimate, 1991	

The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000 square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent western States in the Columbia River drainage basin. BPA markets hydroelectric power from 30 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. BPA also markets and exchanges surplus electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

BPA constructs, operates and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system (14,732 circuit-miles of transmission line and 387 substations).

Public Law 93-454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, placed BPA on a self-financed basis. With the passage in 1980 of Public Law 96-501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, BPA's responsibilities were expanded to include meeting the net firm load growth of the region, investing in cost-effective, regionwide energy conservation, and acquiring generating resources to meet these requirements.

BORROWING AUTHORITY

A total of $3.75 billion has been made available to BPA as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts BPA plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation on Bonneville's borrowing requirements. For FY 1991, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $230.7 million in new borrowing authority for FY 1991 for system planning and construction, system maintenance, energy conservation, fish and wildlife, and capital equipment programs. The budget request for new borrowing authority was $170.1 million. The recommendation includes a $45.6 million higher estimate of obligation of borrowing authority for the Third A.C. Intertie, and an additional $15 million for the conservation program.

LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS

The Commission recommends that no new direct loans be made in fiscal year 1991, as requested in the budget. This level is adequate for BPA to carry out its responsibilities as required by law.

FISH ENHANCEMENT FACILITIES

The Committee recommends approval of the Administration's proposal to construct the Yakima Basin Screen Facilities Phase II. This project involves fish screening facilities for juvenile salmon and steelhead out-migrating from the Yakima system, primarily from tributary streams.

CONSERVATION

The President's FY 1991 budget assumed that a substantial portion (78 percent) of BPA's conservation program would be expensed and financed with revenues. In prior years, BPA has expensed a smaller portion of these activities. The Committee expects BPA to ensure that only those investments in conservation activities which have long-term benefits beyond the rate period are capitalized, and that it adheres to prevailing utility industry and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission standards in determining which items are expensed and which are capitalized. However, the Committee is concerned that the budget proposal is too restrictive and could limit access to borrowing for conservation activities. Thus, the Committee has provided an additional $15 million of FY 1991 borrowing authority, for a total of $32 million, to ensure that resources are adequate to conduct conservation resource acquisitions using current industry standards.

PACIFIC INTERTIE

BPA funding to continue work on the Third A.C. Intertie is included in this budget. The Committee recognizes that the inability of California Investor Owned Utilities to receive approval to proceed with the project has delayed the initiation of project construction. The Committee recognizes that, due to this delay, it may be necessary for a substantial amount of BPA's planned FY 1990 design and procurement activities and previously estimated borrowing authority to shift into FY 1991, increasing obligations of borrowing authority above current FY 1991 estimates.

The President's FY 1991 budget assumes the continued availability of BPA borrowing for construction of the Third A.C. system upgrades, but for FY 1991 and subsequent years, assumes about two-thirds of such costs would be financed by non-Federal participants. The FY 1991 budget assumes payments of $45.6 million will be collected in FY 1991 from non-Federal participants, which along with $22.0 million of estimated use of new borrowing authority would provide for $67.6 million of new obligations. If non-Federal participation payments are not received, the Committee expects BPA to use BPA's existing borrowing authority to finance the project.

While BPA began a rate case in November 1989 to determine a pricing methodology for non-Federal participation and is preparing an implementation plan for its environmental impact statement on non-Federal participation and non-Federal ownership options, the Committee believes these processes cannot be completed soon enough so that potential non-Federal funds could be received during FY 1991. Because of this, the FY 1991 estimated use of BPA's borrowing authority for the Third A.C. system is recommended at $67.6 million by the Committee. This will financially assure that the Federal government can expeditiously initiate the construction of this project as authorized by Public Law 98-360.

The Committee recognizes that the FY 1990, FY 1991 and outyear amounts of borrowing authority and obligations can change in accordance with changes in the schedule of the line, but that BPA's ability to move ahead with the line is key to providing confidence to financial markets and regulators such that the southern end of the line can also proceed on schedule. The Administrator should notify the Committee of any schedule changes and needed funding adjustments in the FY 1992 budget submission or sooner if required.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1990	$18,456,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	9,285,000
Recommended, 1991	9,285,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	–9,171,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	....

The Southeastern Power Administration (SEPA) markets hydroelectric power produced at Corps of Engineers construction projects in 10 southeastern states. There are 22 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092 megawatts.

Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through "wheeling" arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

The Committee recommendation of $9,285,000 is the same as the budget request and provides for continuation of the basic power marketing program. This level of funding also reflects the availability for use of unobligated appropriations from prior fiscal years.

The Administration is proposing in FY 1991 to sell the marketing rights of the Georgia-Alabama System to existing power customers. The SEPA budget does not include any funds to study this proposal nor does the recommended appropriation. The Committee reiterates its position that the proposed study and actual divestiture of any SEPA assets require the enactment of appropriate authorizing legislation. To date, such legislation has not been enacted.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1990	$25,057,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	20,107,000
Recommended, 1991	20,107,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−4,950,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	....

The Southwestern Power Administration (SWPA) is the marketing agent for the power generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana with a total installed capacity of 2,150,000 kilowatts. It operates and maintains some 1,380 miles of transmission lines, 23 generating projects, 24 substations, and 35 radio and microwave stations, and sells its power at wholesale primarily to publicly and cooperatively owned electric distribution utilities.

The recommended appropriation for fiscal year 1991 is the same as the budget request, and continues to reflect the availability for use of unobligated appropriations from prior fiscal years.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1990	$290,654,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	293,762,000
Recommended, 1991	293,762,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+3,108,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	....

The Western Area Power Administration (Western) is responsible for marketing electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission which operate hydropower generating plants in 15 central and western states encompassing a 1.3 million square-mile geographic area. Western is also responsible for the operation and maintenance of 16,554 miles of high-voltage transmission lines with over 259 substations. Western distributes power generated by 51 plants with a maximum operating capacity of 10,407 megawatts.

Western, through its power marketing program, must secure revenues sufficient to meet the annual costs of operation and maintenance of the generating and transmission facilities, purchased power, wheeling and other expenses, in order to repay all of the power investment with interest, and to repay that portion of the Government's irrigation and other nonpower investments which are beyond the water users' repayment capability. Under the Colorado River Basins Power Marketing Fund, which encompasses the Colorado River Basin, Fort Peck, and Colorado River Storage Facilities, all operation and maintenance and power marketing expenses are financed from revenues.

CALIFORNIA-OREGON TRANSMISSION PROJECT

The Committee continues to be concerned that the construction of the Harold T. "Bizz" Johnson California-Pacific Intertie transmission line, also known as the California-Oregon Transmission Project or COTP, has been slowed by the continued inability of the Project's investor-owned utility participants to complete the process of obtaining regulatory approval from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for their participation in this Congressionally authorized project. The desire of Congress and this Committee for this line to be expeditously constructed because of its significant benefits to the region's transmission system and ratepayers has been unwavering. The Committee therefore notes with approval that the Project Manager, the Transmission Agency of Northern California (TANC), is prepared to finance up to the entire amount of project costs, and is taking the actions required to keep the project on schedule pending completion of the CPUC application process.

The Committee will look upon any further delays in completing the CPUC process as a lack of interest by the investor-owned utilities in participating in the Project. The Committee commends the Administrators of the Western Area Power Administration and the Bonneville Power Administration for taking the actions necessary to keep the project interconnection on schedule. The Committee supports efforts by TANC, Western and Bonneville to go forward with the COTP and Pacific Northwest reinforcements even if the investor-owned utilities ultimately are not participants, and, in this event, the California investor-owned utilities will be expected to provide the remaining project participants transmission service at reasonable cost over existing transmission facilities owned by the California investor-owned utilities to the extent such service is needed to fulfill the Project's purposes as defined in the COTP Memorandum of Understanding. However, if those utilities are unwilling or unable to provide the required transmission services, the Administrator of Western should plan to provide, either through acquisition or construction, such facilities that the participants determine are necessary.

SHASTA DAM

For several years, the Bureau of Reclamation has been releasing water from Shasta Dam to insure protection of salmon stocks in the Sacramento River. These releases have resulted in diminished power generation at Shasta Dam, which has required that the Western Area Power Administration purchase more expensive power to fulfill its contractual commitments to its customers. Because only one class of Central Valley Project beneficiaries—power customers—is currently required to bear the entire cost of the cold water release program and because the program is of benefit to many interests on the River, the Committee has included language in the bill that makes the cost of this program nonreimbursable. It is the Committee's intention that this provision shall not apply to revenues foregone as a result of bypass releases, but rather only to the cost of power purchases necessary to fulfill contractual commitments.

The Committee recommendation of $293,762,000, the same as the budget request, reflects the availability for use of unobligated appropriations from prior fiscal years.

COLORADO RIVER DAM FUND

The Committee recommends bill language as requested by the Administration to implement the provisions of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984.

FEDERAL ENFRGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1990	$114,918,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	122,750,000
Recommended, 1991	122,750,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+7,832,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 1990	−$114,918,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	−122,750,000
Recommended, 1991	−122,750,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−7,832,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1990	
Budget Estimate, 1991	
Recommended, 1991	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	
Budget Estimate, 1991	

The budget request provides for program activities of $122,750,000. The Administration proposes to establish revenues at a rate equal to program activities resulting in a zero net appropriation.

The Committee continues to urge the Commission to expedite the review process and continue its progress in reducing the backlog of cases pending before it, and to reduce the amount of time it takes to reach a final Commission decision on new filings.

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

Appropriation, 1990	$74,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	80,000
Recommended, 1991	80,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+6,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	....

The Geothermal Resources Development Fund was established to accelerate the development and utilization of geothermal energy through loan guarantees which facilitate private credit to geothermal projects. The Committee recommendation is the same as the budget request.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1990	$147,900,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	50,000,000
Recommended, 1991	150,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+2,100,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+100,000,000

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) is a regional economic development agency that represents a partnership of Federal, state and local governments. Established in 1965, it is composed of the Governors of the 13 Appalachian states and a Federal Co-Chairman who is appointed by the President. Local participation in the program involves multicounty local development districts with boards consisting of elected officials, businessmen and other local leaders.

Annually, Congress appropriates funds for highways and area development programs, the latter providing support for community facilities, health, education, housing, energy and other essentials to economic development. Appalachian Governors, in consultation with local development districts, draw up annual Appalachian development programs and select for ARC approval projects to implement these programs.

The legislation establishing ARC defines Appalachia as including 397 counties in 13 Appalachian States, with a population of over 20 million people.

The House of Representatives on April 4, 1990, passed by a vote of 340–82, the bill (H.R. 2015) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, which would authorize $185,000,000 for ARC programs for each of the fiscal years 1991, 1992 and 1993. Passage of this bill reflects a commitment by the House to maintain and continue a Federal role in regional and subregional economic development.

The Committee has received extensive testimony regarding the significant need in the ARC region. The Committee is concerned that important needs are not being met at the funding level of $50,000,000 proposed by the President for fiscal year 1991. The Committee recommendation of $150,000,000 would continue ongoing, essential programs in Appalachia.

The appropriation finances the full costs of the Office of the Federal Co-Chairman and 50 percent of the administrative expenses of the Commission. The recommendation provides for a personnel level in 1991 sufficient to administer ARC programs.

The Committee does not agree with the premise that economic and community development programs in disadvantaged regions of the country have served their purpose and exist merely to meet local needs. The interests of each State region and locality are of concern and importance to the national interest, and continuation of the Appalachian Regional Commission serves the national interests and acts as a model of Federal/state cooperation. Furthermore, although much has been accomplished in Appalachia as a result of the ARC program, much remains to be done to equalize the region with the rest of the country.

The Committee encourages the Commission to facilitate the transfer of the Northwest Mississippi Junior College extension building in Benton County to the county school system and to strengthen the clinic at Hickory Flat.

It is for the long-term benefit of the region and the Nation that the Committee recommends continuation of the Appalachian Regional Commission until economic parity with the rest of the Nation can be achieved. This, along with the desire to create a viable tax base, private sector support systems and provide essential public services as roads, transportation, health care and educational and vocational opportunity, is the Committee's basis for maintaining the major elements of the Appalachian Regional Development Program.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1990	$6,865,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	12,500,000
Recommended, 1991	11,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+4,135,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	−1,500,000

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board was created by the 1989 Defense Authorization Act. The Board, composed of five members appointed by the President, advises the Secretary of Energy and reports to Congress on the Department of Energy's defense nuclear facilities.

The Board is responsible for reviewing and evaluating the content and implementation of the standards relating to the design, construction, operation and decommissioning of defense nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy. The Board recommends to the Secretary of Energy specific measures that should be adopted to ensure that public health and safety are adequately protected.

Fiscal year 1991 will be the first full year of operation for the Board, having spent much of fiscal year 1990 performing initial operational activities and hiring staff. The Committee recommendation is $11,000,000. In addition, the use of $1,500,000 in unobligated balances from prior years is available for use, providing full funding for activities proposed in fiscal year 1991.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1990	$211,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	224,000
Recommended, 1991	224,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+13,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

The Delaware River Basin Commission was created by compact (Public Law 87-328) among the States of Delaware, New Jersey, New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Federal government.

The Compact enables the Commission to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Delaware River and its tributaries.

This appropriation provides for the expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and her staff. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $224,000, the same as the budget request.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1990	$340,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	457,000
Recommended, 1991	457,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+117,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expenses budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission. $457,000 is recommended as the Federal contribution to the Commission's $2,689,900 current expense budget for 1991.

The Federal government is one of five members of the Delaware River Basin Commission. The Commissioners have agreed that the Federal government's share of operating expenses is an "equal partner" share, or 20%. The increase provided in FY 1991 is the final step toward achieving the 20% Federal share.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriation, 1990	$296,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	
Recommended, 1991	200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−96,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+200,000

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by compact among the four states in the basin, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, plus the District of Columbia and the Federal government.

The Commission has the responsibility for Basinwide water quality, planning, program coordination and assistance.

The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. These funds will permit the Commission to act as the local sponsor for the Corps of Engineers Anacostia River and Tributaries study. Language has been included in the bill to verify that the funds may be used for that purpose. The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin is uniquely suited to act as the local sponsor for this study. The Commission is already actively involved in efforts to cleanup the Anacostia River and has been successful in leading the cleanup of the Potomac River.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1990	$435,911,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	471,320,000
Recommended, 1991	471,320,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+35,409,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

REVENUES

Appropriation, 1990	-$146,850,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	-156,750,000
Recommended, 1991	-156,750,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1991	-9,900,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1990	$289,061,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	314,570,000
Recommended, 1991	314,570,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+25,509,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

The Administration proposes that $19,650,000 of the appropriation for the NRC be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund. These funds are required to fund the NRC efforts focused on implementation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act as amended in 1987 and DOE's efforts to characterize the Yucca Mountain site. The Administration also proposed appropriation language which includes a provision for collection of the authorized revenues of $156,750,000.

The Committee commends the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for its recent rulemaking on standardization and licensing reform that will go far toward removing the uncertain licensing process as a major obstacle to continued development of nuclear power. The Committee has long urged the Commission to take action on these issues and believes the final rule to be a major step in making necessary improvements in the nuclear licensing process. The Committee is also encouraged by the Commission's thoughtfulness and persistence in a number of difficult licensing decisions.

The Committee strongly urges the Commission to devote the necessary resources to expedite the review and certification process of the standard reactor designs submitted to the NRC for approval. The Committee also urges that priority be given to expediting the review of reactor life extension.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 1990	$2,859,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	3,680,000
Recommended, 1991	3,680,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	821,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

This appropriation provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988 established a statutory Office of the Inspector General within the NRC, effective on April 17,1989. The function of the Office of the Inspector General is to provide the Commission with an independent review and appraisal of the integrity of NRC programs and operations. Internal audits review and evaluate all facets of agency operations. The investigative function provides for the detection and investigation of improper and illegal activities involving agency programs, personnel, and operations.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1990	$197,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	211,000
Recommended, 1991	211,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+14,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission was created by compact (Public Law 91-575) among the states of Maryland and New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal government to enable them to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River and its tributaries.

This appropriation provides for the expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $211,000, the same as the budget request.

CONTRIBUTION TO SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1990	$272,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	290,000
Recommended, 1991	290,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+18,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expenses budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission. The amount recommended for the Federal contribution is $290,000 of a current expense budget for 1991 of $1,795,000.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriation, 1990	$119,306,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	91,302,000
Recommended, 1991	135,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	+15,694,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	+43,698,000

The Committee recommends $135,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), an increase of $43,698,000 over the budget request. The following table reflects the 1990 program, the budget request and the Committee's recommendation:

[In thousands of dollars]

	1990 estimate	1991 budget request	1991 committee recommendation
Stewardship	$51,229	$63,874	$67,797
Water and Land	11,080	4,980	9,861
Land Between The Lakes	3,398	2,348	4,600
Rural Development	20,568		20,634
National Fertilizer and Environmental Research Center	33,031	20,100	32,108
Total appropriations	119,306	91,302	135,000

TVA has been entrusted with a broad array of public lands, associated physical facilities, and natural resources in connection with research, development, operation, and management activities conducted by the agency to fulfill its mission. To assure present day use and the availability of these resources and facilities for future generations, adequate stewardship is required to preserve and enhance this Federal investment. This responsibility includes maintaining a system of dams, reservoirs, and navigation facilities; refurbishing outmoded public facilities and other structures; performing adequate routine and cyclic maintenance; and maintaining and managing over 300,000 acres of public land and 11,000 miles of shoreline efficiently and in an environmentally sound manner.

The Committee believes that rural economic development is also an integral part of TVA's role, as set forth in the TVA Act of 1933, and has provided funding for TVA to continue this work in fiscal year 1991. Today, TVA's economic development efforts are directed principally at helping close the economic disparities encountered in the Valley's rural areas. The major areas of emphasis are maintaining a competitive manufacturing sector, upgrading literacy and job skills, expanding the service sector, strengthening rural economic leadership, and leveraging capital funds. TVA carries out these activities in partnership with other public sector and private sector entities. As a consequence, the total net impact of TVA's efforts is many times greater than the funds provided in this Act. TVA also conducts many of its economic development programs as national demonstrations that benefit persons and groups across the Nation.

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR WASTE NEGOTIATOR

Appropriation, 1990	$1,972,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	
Recommended, 1991	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−1,972,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

This appropriation provides for the Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed the Nuclear Waste Negotiator to attempt to find a state or Indian tribe willing to host a nuclear waste repository or monitored retrievable storage facility at a technically qualified site on reasonable terms and to negotiate with any state or Indian tribe which expressed an interest in hosting a repository or monitored retrievable storage facility. The Administration has not requested additional appropriations for this activity because of the availability of unobligated balances.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriation, 1990	$1,972,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	
Recommended, 1991	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1990	−1,972,000
Budget Estimate, 1991	

This appropriation provides for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed the Board to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of the activities of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board must report its findings not less than two times a year to the Congress and the Secretary of Energy. The Administration has not requested additional appropriations for this activity because of the availability of unobligated balances.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

FUNDING OF INTERVENORS

Language is included under General Provisions restricting the payment of intervenors in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act. This language is the same as that which has been included in past bills.

RATE REVISION FOR POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

A general provision is included that would prohibit the use of funds to conduct any studies relating or leading to "market rate" pricing for the six Federal power authorities.

APPLICATION OF GENERAL REDUCTIONS

The Committee has recommended bill language to provide direction for the application of General Reductions, Savings and Slippage and possible sequestrations required in FY 1991 by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

For the purposes of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations, programs, projects and activities are defined to include any and all individual items or line items listed, discussed, described, included in or in any way identified or referred to in narrative or tabular documentation or references, including but not limited to the FY 1991 budget submission of the President and supporting justification material as subsequently altered, modified or changed by Congressional action identified in House and Senate Committee reports.

It is the intention that, for purposes of applying unspecified reductions, each program, project and activity, as defined above, shall be reduced proportionately by applying the same reduction percentage as the percentage by which the account is reduced overall. It is not intended that this be used (1) to eliminate programs, projects or activities, (2) to disproportionately reduce personnel, (3) to otherwise reorder funds or priorities, or (4) to initiate unfunded new programs, projects or activities.

PROCUREMENT OF ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT

The importance of our electrical supply, transmission, and distribution system to the national security and economy cannot be overstated. Electrical power is critical to the operation of our increasingly high-technology society.

In light of the important national security and industrial mobilization interest in maintaining a domestic EHV manufacturing capability, the Committee believes that Federal agencies, to the extent practicable, should purchase such equipment from United

States manufacturers. Accordingly, the Committee has included language in the bill for the amount of the so-called "Buy American" differential at thirty percent for purchases of EHV electrical equipment by Federal power authorities. Under this provision, the Federal Power Marketing Administrations and the Tennessee Valley Authority are required to purchase their EHV power equipment from domestic manufacturers if the domestic equipment meets the agency's technical requirements, and if the price of such domestic equipment is not more than thirty percent greater than the price of the most competitive foreign bid. The increased Buy American differential would not apply to purchases of EHV equipment manufactured in countries that offer fair competitive opportunities to United States manufacturers of such equipment. In administering this provision, the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, shall determine whether non-domestic end product EHV power equipment sought to be sold to an agency subject to this provision is manufactured in a country that offers fair competitive opportunities to United States manufacturers of EHV power equipment. In essence, this involves determining whether or not the country in question imposes unfair trade barriers on United States manufacturers of EHV equipment that are more restrictive than those imposed by the United States on non-United States manufacturers of such equipment. Among the factors to be considered in making this determination, with no single factor being dispositive, are whether the utilities of the country in question are free to, or in fact do, make significant purchases of United States manufactured EHV power equipment; whether procurement opportunities are publicly advertised or otherwise made available in a manner that enables United States manufacturers of EHV power equipment to meaningfully participate in such procurement competition; and whether procurement contracts for EHV power equipment are awarded on the basis of the most competitive bid. It is the Committee's intention that any exemptions granted pursuant to this provision shall remain in effect unless evidence of a change in the underlying facts upon which the original exemption was granted comes to the attention of the Secretary of Energy or the United States Trade Representative.

For the purposes of this provision, "EHV power equipment" shall refer to alternating current (AC) and direct current (DC) electrical equipment designed to be operated on systems rated above 242 kilovolts. According to the Department of Energy, such AC electrical equipment includes: power transformers, circuit breakers, shunt reactors, voltage and current transformers, disconnect and grounding switches, surge arrestors, coupling capacitors, phase shifting transformers, series and shunt power capacity banks, and relays; and such DC electrical equipment includes: smoothing reactors, DC valves, disconnect and grounding switches, DC breakers, voltage dividers, current transductors, surge arrestors, and converter transformers.

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XIII, CLAUSE 3 (RAMSEYER)

In compliance with clause 3 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Repesentatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

The accompanying bill would amend Section 4(t)(3)(F) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988, Public Law 100-676, as follows:

> "(F) Upon transfer of OMR&R responsibility to the city in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, the Secretary shall further modify the project contract to forgive the city's OMR&R payment obligations in excess of $200,000 for the period beginning October 1, 1988, and ending [September 30, 1989] *on the date of transfer of OMR&R responsiblity to the City: Provided,* That the total amount forgiven shall not exceed $600,000.".

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

The following items are included in accordance with various requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

INFLATIONARY IMPACT STATEMENT

Clause 2(l)(4) of rule XI of the House of Representatives requires that each committee report on a bill or resolution shall contain a statement as to whether enactment of such bill or resolution may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

Titles I and II of the bill contain $4.5 billion for planning, construction and maintenance of water resource development projects. Water is an important input for many industries as well as for private residences. The Committee believes that public works projects will provide for stable supplies of water at lower costs than would be incurred under alternative institutional arrangements. Similarly, many projects will provide for increased supplies of hydroelectric power at costs below every other electric power production alternative.

Public works projects also provide for improved and lower cost water transportation which can reduce the prices of goods by lowering the input costs of industrial production and encouraging large-scale cost industrial production. Lower transportation costs also allow more producers to enter more markets, thereby giving consumers the benefits of increased competition and lower prices.

Titles III and IV of the bill contain approximately $4.9 billion in new budget authority for various energy programs. Every citizen of the United States is well aware of the economic and inflationary impact of the rapid increase in the price of imported oil beginning in 1974. These price increases prompted major increases in the price of all domestic petroleum fuels and significantly increased aggregate inflation. These programs and activities will contribute directly to increasing the supply and availability of more abundant, less costly domestic sources of energy.

Environmental restoration activities to prevent near-term adverse health and environmental impacts are funded at approximately $3.2 billion in this bill. This program will reduce health and safety risks, and the technology development should ultimately reduce the costs of cleanup of sites and facilities. In addition, the bill contains approximately $8.2 billion for atomic energy defense research and production. These activities help develop defense technology which meets the national security requirements of the United States and our allies at significantly lower costs.

The Committee concludes that this will result in less inflationary impact.

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how the authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302 of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year. This information follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Sec. 302(b)		This bill	
	Discretionary	Mandatory	Discretionary	Mandatory
Budget authority	20,900		20,900	
Outlays	19,900		19,840	
Direct loans	32		5	
Primary guarantees				

The bill provides no new spending authority as described in section 401(c)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended.

FIVE-YEAR PROJECTIONS

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, the following information was provided to the Committee by the Congressional Budget Office:

Budget authority	20,900,000,000
Outlays:	
1991	12,856,062,000
1992	6,470,811,000
1993	1,375,920,000
1994	63,913,000
1995 and beyond	33,012,000

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(D) of Public Law 93-344, the new budget authority and outlays provided by the accompanying bill for financial assistance to State and local governments are as follows:

Budget authority	143,999,000
Fiscal year 1991 outlays resulting therefrom	10,156,000

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 1(b), rule X, the following is submitted describing the transfer of funds provided in the accompanying bill:

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program:

> * * * of which $145,063,000 shall be available for transfers to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund authorized by section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), and $185,768,000 shall be available for transfers to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund authorized

by section 403 of the Act of September 30, 1968 (43 U.S.C. 1543), and such amounts as may be necessary shall be considered as though advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund for the Boulder Canyon Project as authorized by the Act of December 21, 1928, as amended: *Provided,* That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities which can be financed by the reclamation fund shall be derived from that fund: *Provided further,* That transfers to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund may be increased or decreased by transfers within the overall appropriation under this heading * * *

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Special Funds:

> * * * Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified * * *

Under Title III, Department of Energy, Western Area Power Administration,

> * * * of which $266,101,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation fund; in addition, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer from the Colorado River Dam Fund to the Western Area Power Administration $4,702,000 to carry out the power marketing and transmission activities of the Boulder Canyon project as provided in section 104(a)(4) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984, to remain available until expended.

Under Title III, General Provisions, Department of Energy:

> SEC. 302. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for Department of Energy activities funded in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise provided, shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and any such proposed transfers shall be submitted promptly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

Under Title III, General Provisions, Department of Energy:

> SEC. 303. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

Under Title IV, Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

> * * * *Provided,* That from this appropriation, transfer of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred

> may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred:

Under Title IV, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Inspector General:

> * * * and in addition, not to exceed 5 percent of this sum may be transferred from Salaries and Expenses, Nuclear Regulatory Commission: *Provided,* That notice of such transfers shall be given to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate: *Provided further,* That from this appropriation, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred.

CHANGES IN APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3, rule XXI of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect on provisions in the accompanying bill which may directly or indirectly change or be perceived to change the application of existing law.

Language is included in the bill under Corps of Engineers, General Investigations, earmarking funds for the following projects: Casino Beach, Chicago, Illinois; McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois; Lake George, Hobart, Indiana; Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana; Ste. Genevieve, Missouri; Red River Waterway, Shreveport, Louisiana, to Daingerfield, Texas; Miami River Sediments, Florida; Monroe County Beach Erosion (Smathers Beach) Florida; Wyoming Valley Levee Raising, Pennsylvania; and Taylorsville Lake (Routt Road Bridge), Kentucky.

Also included under General Investigations is language directing the Corps of Engineers to use previously appropriated funds for engineering and design of the La Conner, Washington, project; language authorizing the Secretary of the Army to conduct research and development of a magnetic levitation transportation system; and language directing the Corp to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors project upon completion of the feasibility report.

Under General Investigations, Corps of Engineers, language is included directing the Corps of Engineers to perform preconstruction engineering and design of the Red River Waterway, Index, Arkansas, to Denison Dam, Texas, project using previously appropriated funds and funds provided in the bill.

Language is included under Corps of Engineers, General Investigations, providing for detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction. Language is also included under General Investigations limiting funds available for obligation for research and development.

Language is included in the bill under Corps of Engineers, Construction, General, earmarking funds for the following projects:

O'Hare Reservoir, IL,
Red River Emergency Bank Protection, AR and LA,
Hansen Dam, CA,

Kissimmee River, FL,
Wallisville Lake, TX,
Red River Basin, Chloride Control, TX and OK,
Shinnecock Inlet, NY,
Platte River Streambank Erosion Control, NE,
San Diego River and Mission Bay, CA, and
Tampa Bay (Port Sutton), FL.

Under Construction, General for the Corps of Engineers, language is included relating to the alteration and removal of obstructive bridges.

The bill includes language under Corps of Engineers, Construction, General, earmarking funds for the Harlan, Kentucky, and Barbourville, Kentucky, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project and language stating that no fully allocated funding policy shall apply to those projects.

Also included under Construction, General, is language directing the Corps of Engineers to undertake the Kanawha River, Charleston and Saint Albans, West Virginia, projects using previously appropriated funds; language permitting the non-Federal sponsors for the Fort Toulouse, Alabama, and Mound State Park, Alabama, projects to provide their share of the projects with work in-kind; and language directing the Corp to construct the Salyersville, Kentucky and Sacramento River Flood Control, California, projects.

The bill contains language under Construction, General authorizing the Corps of Engineers to construct the Lower and Middle Rouge Rivers rivers projects in Michigan using funds appropriated in the bill. Language is also included earmarking funds for the Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt, Iowa, project, and the Red Lock Lake and Dam, Iowa, project.

Under Construction, General, language is also included in the bill directing the Corps of Engineers to repair the Tulsa and West Tulsa, Oklahoma, Local Protection Project.

The bill contains language under Corps of Engineers, Construction, General permitting use of funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

Under Corps of Engineers, Cosntruction, General, language is included directing the Secretary of the Army to construct the Sam Timoteo feature of the Santa Ana River Mainstem project.

The bill contains language for the Corps of Engineers under Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries directing that not less than $250,000 be available for bank stabilization measures.

The bill also includes language under Mississippi River and Tributaries providing that funds available for operation and maintenance of Yazoo Basin Lakes shall be available for maintenance of roads and trails; language directing the Corps of Engineers to initiate construction of the Horn Lake Creek, Mississippi and Tennessee project; and language relating to the acquisition of land in the Atchafalaya River Basin Floodway System.

For Operation and Maintenance for the Corps of Engineers, the following language is included:

> Including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipal-

ity or other public agency, outside the harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation.

Also under Operation and Maintenance, language is included providing for construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities.

The bill includes language under Operation and Maintenance for the Corps of Engineers permitting the use of funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. Language is provided under Corps of Engineers, Operation and Maintenance directing continuation of the Sauk Lake, Minnesota, project.

Language is also included under Operation and Maintenance earmarking funds for: a Long Term Management Strategy for dredged material disposal in San Francisco Bay; the continuation of recreation development at Sepulveda Dam, California; the construction of access facilities in the McAlpine Lock and Dam Navigation Pool; and maintenance of structures of the Missouri National Recreation River, Nebraska and South Dakota, project.

Under Operation and Maintenance, language is included directing the Corps of Engineers to undertake a major rehabilitation of the Johnstown, Pennsylvania, project. Language is also included directing the Corps to undertake improvements at the Crowder Point East Recreation Area at Lake Enfaula, Oklahoma and directing the Corps to maintain Bugtussle Road at Lake Enfaula, Oklahoma. Language is also included under Operation and Maintenance limiting funds available for national emergency preparedness programs.

Language is included in the bill under Regulatory Program of the Corps of Engineers regarding the regulation of navigable waters, including bridges, and wetlands of the United States.

Under Corps of Engineers, General Expenses language is included making the funds available until expended. Also under General Expenses, language is included relating to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the Coastal Engineering Research Board, the Engineer Automation Support Activity, and the Water Resources Support Center.

Language is included under General Provisions, Corps of Engineers, amending the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 relating to the Wynoochee Lake, Washington, project.

Language is included under General Provisions, Corps of Engineers authorizing and directing the Corps of Engineers to undertake the Pennington Creek project at Denison Dam, Texas and authorizing and directing the Corps to construct loading facilities at Boudinot Harbor, Oklahoma, on the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System.

Also included under General Provisions, Corps of Engineers, is language amending the cost estimate for the Brush Creek, Missouri, project and language relating to reimbursement for work performed by the local sponsor on the Maumee Bay, Ohio, project.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, General Investigations providing that funds be derived from the Reclamation Fund.

Language is also included under Bureau of Reclamation, General Investigations permitting advance planning projects to be fully reimbursable.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, General Investigations and Construction Program providing that funds contributed by non-Federal entities shall be available for expenditure.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program providing that no funds shall be available for the Cliff Dam feature of the Central Arizona Project.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program which restricts the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis unit.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program providing that funding for the Boulder Canyon Project will be treated as though advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program which permits fund transfers within the overall appropriation to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program providing that such sums as necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program providing that no funds shall be available for construction or operation of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering any national monument.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program, providing that the funds contained in this Act for the Garrison Diversion Unit, North Dakota, shall be expended only in accordance with the provisions of the Garrison Diversion Unit Reformulation Act of 1986.

Language is included under Title II regarding the source of appropriated funds in the Construction Program.

Language is also included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program, providing that the costs of safety of dams work at Coolidge Dam, Arizona are in addition to the amount authorized for safety of dams work in 43 U.S.C. 506.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Operation and Maintenance relating to use of fees collected for certain recreation activities.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Operation and Maintenance making funds available until expended. The language also provides for a replacement program through readvances to the Colorado River Dam Fund.

For Operation and Maintenance, language is included regarding the source of appropriated funds.

Clarifying language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Operation, and Maintenance relating to the costs of the examination of existing structures program.

For the Bureau of Reclamation, Operation and Maintenance funds collected and used pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 395 from water users are made available until expended.

Language is included under the Loan Program limiting gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans.

For the Loan Program, language is included regarding the source of appropriated funds.

For the Bureau of Reclamation's Loan Program, language is included to limit the condition on loans. The proviso has been included in appropriations acts since 1959 to permit the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts on loan program projects which cover such time as the Secretary deems necessary but in which the liability of the United States is contingent upon appropriations being made therefor.

Language is included under General Administrative Expenses referring to the 5 Bureau of Reclamation regions.

Language is included under General Administrative Expenses making a portion of the funds appropriated available until expended. Language is also included relating to the source of funds for General Administrative Expenses and prohibiting the use of other appropriations for general administrative functions.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Emergency Fund providing that funds be derived from the Reclamation Fund.

Language is included under Special Funds identifying the special funds authorized by law from which funds are made available to the Bureau of Reclamation as authorized and making it explicit that such unexpended balances of such funds are to be returned to sources from which derived.

Under the Administrative Provisions for Bureau of Reclamation, language is included for those items which are authorized subject to language in an authorization bill. The paragraph limits the use of funds to amounts earned under the terms of a contract, otherwise the incurring of obligations is in violation of 31 U.S.C. 1341. Also, language is included providing that no funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance except those derived from advances by water users shall be used for the particular benefits of land.

Language is included under Administrative Provisions clarifying the surveying and mapping procurement process of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Language is also included under Administrative Provisions, Bureau of Reclamation related to the uniform allowance for each uniformed employee of the Bureau.

Under General Provisions, Department of the Interior, Section 201 provides that the Secretary may use funds in Title II for emergency work; Section 202 allows the Secretary to use funds in Title II to fight forest or range fires; Section 203 allows the operation of certain facilities; and Section 204 provides that funds will be available for certain purposes necessary to carry out the Department's responsibilities.

Also under General Provisions, Department of the Interior, Section 205 authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract for repayment of the water supply, delivery, and associated facilities at the McGee Project, Oklahoma.

Language is included under General Provisions, Department of the Interior, Sec. 206, providing that none of the funds in the bill or any other act may be used to execute new water contracts from the Central Valley Project, California, with the exception that the Secretary is directed to enter into three new water contracts.

Title III—Language is included under Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities earmarking funds for the following facilities: Advanced Technology Center, Indiana State University; Technology Development and Transfer Center, University of New Orleans; Biomedical Research Facility, University of Alabama at Birmingham; Biomedical Research Facility, Case Western Reserve University; and Energy Science Research Facility, Boston College.

Language is included for Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities and Departmental Administration accounts, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and consistent with the authorization in Public Law 95–238, to permit DOE to utilize revenues to offset appropriations. The appropriation language for these accounts reflects the total estimated program funding to be reduced as revenues are received.

Language is included under the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund limiting the funds available to the State of Nevada and the local government; and prohibiting use of funds to influence legislative action on this matter.

Language is included under Isotope Production and Distribution Program Fund providing for the application of revenues as a credit to the account.

Language is included under Departmental Administration to permit the Department of Energy to cover increases in the cost of work for others provided that increases are offset by increased revenues and to include plant and capital expenses funding along with operating expenses and waives 31 U.S.C. 1511 and 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriation acts.

Language is included under the Bonneville Power Administration for construction of fish facilities.

Language is included precluding any new direct loan obligations for the Bonneville Power Administration.

Language is included under the Southwestern Power Administration, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, to permit Southwestern to utilize reimbursements from the Department of Defense, various Oklahoma companies, and other non-Federal entities.

Language is included under Western Area Power Administration that authorizes purchase, operation, and maintenance of one replacement helicopter.

Language is included under Western Area Power Administration providing that any increased power purchases resulting from bypass releases at Shasta Dam in California are nonreimbursable.

Language is included under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to permit the hire of passenger motor vehicles, for official entertainment expenses, and to permit the use of revenues collected to reduce the appropriation as revenues are received.

Language is included under the Geothermal Resources Development Fund to limit the amounts in the fund available to $500,000,000.

Language is included under General Provisions, Department of Energy which provides for the purchase, hire, operation and maintenance of automobiles and airplanes; purchase, repair and cleaning of uniforms, reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services; and certain other administrative activities. These provisions have been carried in previous appropriations acts.

Language is included under the Department of Energy allowing transfers of appropriations to the agencies for certain necessary activities. This language has been carried in previous appropriation acts.

Language is included under the Department of Energy to permit transfer of unexpended balances of prior appropriations for activities covered in this Act to a new appropriation account for such activities established pursuant to this Act and the balances merged for accounting as one fund.

The bill includes language under the Department of Energy dealing with the Superconducting Super Collider regarding a goal for making funding available to socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

Language is included under the Department of Energy which directs the Secretary of Energy to use the services of the Corps of Engineers, Walla Walla District, on a reimbursable basis to manage environmental remediation activities at the Hanford Site in Richland, Washington.

Title IV—Language is provided under the Appalachian Regional Development program waiving section 405 of the ARC Act.

Language is provided under the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin allowing use of appropriated funds for the local share of U.S. Corps of Engineers study.

Language is included under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission allowing transfer of appropriations to other agencies for certain necessary activities and waives 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriation acts. Language is also included, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, to permit NRC to utilize revenues collected to offset appropriations.

Language is included which appropriates funds to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from the Nuclear Waste Fund.

Language is included under the Office of Inspector General to permit transfer of funds to other agencies for performance of work.

Language is included under Tennessee Valley Authority permitting payment of allowances authorized by section 5948 of title 5, United States Code. This language has been carried in previous appropriations acts.

Title V—General Provisions contains language, carried in previous appropriations acts, which places limitations on the use of funds in the bill which might under some circumstances, be construed as changing the application of existing law.

Language is included under General Provisions, carried in previous appropriations acts, which prohibits the payment of intervenors in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

A general provision is included prohibiting the elimination or disproportionate reduction of programs, projects or activities.

Language is included limiting the expenditure of funds for contracts for consulting services to those contracts which are a matter of public record and available for public inspection.

Language is included prohibiting the use of funds for a program of retention contracts for senior employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Language is included prohibiting the use of funds for studying certain types of hydroelectric power rate changes. This language has been carried in previous appropriation acts.

A limitation is included that would require agencies included in this act to procure high voltage electrical equipment from American manufacturers under certain conditions.

A general provision is included requiring the absorption of pay raises for fiscal year 1991 from levels within this bill.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1990 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1991

PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY

[These funds become available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill.]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1990 (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1991 (3)	Fiscal year 1991 estimate compared with, fiscal year 1990 (4)
PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY			
FEDERAL FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers - Civil:			
Permanent appropriations	12,000,000	12,000,000	....
Department of the Interior:			
Bureau of Reclamation, misc. appropriations	282,000	280,000	-2,000
Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project	63,608,000	34,165,000	-29,443,000
Department of Energy:			
Payments to States under Federal Power Act	2,249,000	2,343,000	+94,000
Bonneville Power Administration Fund (authority to borrow)	258,200,000	170,100,000	-88,100,000

Tennessee Valley Authority Fund (authority to borrow)	357,673,000	432,672,000	+74,999,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	694,012,000	651,560,000	-42,452,000
TRUST FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers - Civil:			
Rivers and harbors contributed funds	160,000,000	205,500,000	+45,500,000
Department of the Interior:			
Reclamation trust funds	54,100,000	93,886,000	+39,786,000
Department of Energy:			
Advances for cooperative work	27,179,000	18,897,000	-8,282,000
Appalachian Regional Commission:			
Miscellaneous trust funds	4,416,000	4,564,000	+148,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Trust funds	245,695,000	322,847,000	+77,152,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1991

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1990 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with new budget (obligational) authority, 1990 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (6)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	129,251,000	135,400,000	167,847,000	+38,596,000	+32,447,000
Construction, general	1,083,811,000	1,226,000,000	1,362,025,000	+278,214,000	+136,025,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	331,296,000	334,500,000	342,731,000	+11,435,000	+8,231,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,398,219,000	1,389,500,000	1,457,488,000	+59,269,000	+67,988,000
Regulatory program	68,455,000	75,100,000	71,100,000	+2,645,000	-4,000,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	20,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	+5,000,000	....
Revolving Fund	9,860,000	....	....	-9,860,000	....
General expenses	141,997,000	136,100,000	136,100,000	-5,897,000	....
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil, new budget (obligational) authority	3,182,889,000	3,321,600,000	3,562,291,000	+379,402,000	+240,691,000

TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

General investigations	11,369,000	11,456,000	12,926,000	+1,557,000	+1,470,000
Construction program	652,850,000	609,430,000	649,697,000	-3,153,000	+40,267,000
Operation and maintenance	209,315,000	231,516,000	231,516,000	+22,201,000	
Loan program	33,644,000	5,708,000	5,708,000	-27,936,000	
(Limitation on direct loans)	*(31,475,000)*	*(4,946,000)*	*(4,946,000)*	*(-26,529,000)*	
General administrative expenses	47,311,000	51,431,000	51,431,000	+4,120,000	
Emergency fund	986,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+14,000	
Working Capital fund	8,381,000	4,831,000	4,831,000	-3,550,000	
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	*(-3,564,000)*	*(-4,702,000)*	*(-4,702,000)*	*(-1,138,000)*	
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	963,856,000	915,372,000	957,109,000	-6,747,000	+41,737,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior:					
New budget (obligational) authority	963,856,000	915,372,000	957,109,000	-6,747,000	+41,737,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	*(31,475,000)*	*(4,946,000)*	*(4,946,000)*	*(-26,529,000)*	
(By transfer)	*(-3,564,000)*	*(-4,702,000)*	*(-4,702,000)*	*(-1,138,000)*	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1991--Continued

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1990 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with new budget (obligational) authority, 1990 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (6)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:					
Operating Expenses	1,916,768,000	1,788,606,000	2,362,722,000	+445,954,000	+574,116,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	267,681,000	296,631,000	340,550,000	+72,869,000	+43,919,000
Total	2,184,449,000	2,085,237,000	2,703,272,000	+518,823,000	+618,035,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities:					
Operating Expenses	1,347,096,000	1,310,973,000	1,310,973,000	-36,123,000	....
Plant and Capital Equipment	65,341,000	95,045,000	95,045,000	+29,704,000	....
Subtotal	1,412,437,000	1,406,018,000	1,406,018,000	-6,419,000	....
Gross revenues	-1,500,900,000	-1,530,500,000	-1,530,500,000	-29,600,000	....
Net appropriation	-88,463,000	-124,482,000	-124,482,000	-36,019,000	....
General Science and Research Activities:					
Operating Expenses	737,566,000	829,634,000	829,634,000	+92,068,000	....
Plant and Capital Equipment	361,263,000	444,098,000	444,098,000	+82,835,000	....
Total	1,098,829,000	1,273,732,000	1,273,732,000	+174,903,000	....
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	295,156,000	292,833,000	292,833,000	-2,323,000	....

Isotope production and distribution fund	16,016,000	....	....	-16,016,000	....
Environmental restoration and waste management	....	2,791,436,000	....	....	-2,791,436,000
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function	....	*(2,361,751,000)*	*(2,714,807,000)*	*(+2,714,807,000)*	*(+353,056,000)*
Non-defense function	....	*(429,685,000)*	*(563,685,000)*	*(+563,685,000)*	*(+134,000,000)*
Total, Environmental restoration and waste mgmt	....	*(2,791,436,000)*	*(3,278,492,000)*	*(+3,278,492,000)*	*(+487,056,000)*
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:					
Operating Expenses	7,936,225,000	6,994,515,000	8,921,330,000	+985,105,000	+1,926,815,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	1,709,968,000	1,597,485,000	1,993,818,000	+283,850,000	+396,333,000
Total	9,646,193,000	8,592,000,000	10,915,148,000	+1,268,955,000	+2,323,148,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1991--Continued

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1990 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with new budget (obligational) authority, 1990 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (6)
Departmental Administration:					
Operating Expenses	346,854,000	402,898,000	370,153,000	+23,299,000	-32,745,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	3,231,000	4,942,000	4,942,000	+1,711,000	....
Subtotal	350,085,000	407,840,000	375,095,000	+25,010,000	-32,745,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-147,900,000	-183,413,000	-150,000,000	-2,100,000	+33,413,000
Net appropriation	202,185,000	224,427,000	225,095,000	+22,910,000	+668,000
Office of Inspector General	22,638,000	28,421,000	28,421,000	+5,783,000	....
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,134,000	3,233,000	3,233,000	+99,000	....
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	18,456,000	9,285,000	9,285,000	-9,171,000	....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	25,057,000	20,107,000	20,107,000	-4,950,000	....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	290,654,000	293,762,000	293,762,000	+3,108,000	....
(By transfer, permanent authority)	*(3,564,000)*	*(4,702,000)*	*(4,702,000)*	*(+1,138,000)*	....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	337,301,000	326,387,000	326,387,000	-10,914,000	....

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	114,918,000	122,750,000	122,750,000	+7,832,000	....
Revenues Applied	-114,918,000	-122,750,000	-122,750,000	-7,832,000	....
Geothermal Resources Development Fund					
Geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program	74,000	80,000	80,000	+6,000	....
Total, title III, Department of Energy:					
New budget (obligational) authority	13,714,378,000	15,490,071,000	15,640,486,000	+1,926,108,000	+150,415,000
(By transfer)	*(3,564,000)*	*(4,702,000)*	*(4,702,000)*	*(+1,138,000)*	....
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	147,900,000	50,000,000	150,000,000	+2,100,000	+100,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	6,865,000	12,500,000	11,000,000	+4,135,000	-1,500,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1990 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1991--Continued

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority appropriated, 1990 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with new budget (obligational) authority, 1990 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1991 (6)
Delaware River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	211,000	224,000	224,000	+13,000	
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	340,000	457,000	457,000	+117,000	
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	551,000	681,000	681,000	+130,000	
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:					
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	296,000		200,000	-96,000	+200,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	435,911,000	471,320,000	471,320,000	+35,409,000	
Revenues	-146,850,000	-156,750,000	-156,750,000	-9,900,000	
Subtotal	289,061,000	314,570,000	314,570,000	+25,509,000	
Office of Inspector General	2,859,000	3,680,000	3,680,000	+821,000	
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	291,920,000	318,250,000	318,250,000	+26,330,000	
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	197,000	211,000	211,000	+14,000	
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	272,000	290,000	290,000	+18,000	
Total, Susquehanna River Basin Commission	469,000	501,000	501,000	+32,000	

Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	119,306,000	91,302,000	135,000,000	+15,694,000	+43,698,000
Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator	1,972,000	....	....	-1,972,000	....
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	1,972,000	....	....	-1,972,000	....
Total, title IV, Independent agencies, new budget (obligational) authority	571,251,000	473,234,000	615,632,000	+44,381,000	+142,398,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	18,432,374,000	20,200,277,000	20,775,518,000	+2,343,144,000	+575,241,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	*(31,475,000)*	*(4,946,000)*	*(4,946,000)*	*(-26,529,000)*	....
(By transfer)	....	....	....	....	....

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. DAVID R. OBEY

It is a mistake for the Congress to support the full Administration request for the Superconducting Super Collider at this time given the project's cost escalations and the technical uncertainties still surrounding the SSC.

H.R. 4380, the Superconducting Super Collider Project Authorization Act of 1990, made it quite clear to the Department of Energy what we do not intend to write a blank check for the SSC.

That authorization bill set a strict $5 billion federal spending cap on the SSC. The House also made clear its intent to require a number of program milestones such as the successful development and testing of the magnets and the submission by DOE of a detailed project management plan with cost estimates and timetables before the bulk of the project would be funded.

It was the House's concern about the escalating cost of the project, the lack of verified cost estimates and the questionable viability of the technology surrounding the project which led to passage of a number of restrictive amendments.

As of this date, DOE has achieved none of the milestones which H.R. 4380 would require in order to obligate the FY 1991 appropriation. The Department's cost estimates and timetables aren't even out yet so the General Accounting Office hasn't had an opportunity to review them. This project is not only a budget buster but it also will have the effect of gobbling needed dollars from other basic sciences funded in this bill. Given DOE's miserable past track record in producing projects at their originally estimated costs, this project simply should not be funded at this level at this time.

David R. Obey.

○